United Nations S/PV.3954

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

3954th Meeting

Wednesday, 16 December 1998, 9 a.m.
New York

Provisional

President:	Mr. Buallay	(Bahrain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Amorim
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Costa Rica	Mr. Niehaus
	France	Mr. Dejammet
	Gabon	Mr. Essonghé
	Gambia	Mr. Jagne
	Japan	Mr. Konishi
	Kenya	Mrs. Odera
	Portugal	Mr. Monteiro
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Slovenia	Mr. Türk
	Sweden	Mr. Dahlgren
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Burleigh

Agenda

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 9.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): Members of the Security Council will recall that the date and agenda for this meeting of the Security Council were agreed upon by members of the Council in its prior consultations.

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, the Sudan, Tunisia and Ukraine, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Baali (Algeria), Mr. Petrella (Argentina), Ms. Wensley (Australia), Mr. Sucharipa (Austria), Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Mr. Fowler (Canada), Mr. Simonovic (Croatia), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Sharma (India), Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia), Miss Durrant (Jamaica), Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia), Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Kolby (Norway), Mr. Kamel (Pakistan), Mr. Lee See-young (Republic of Korea), Mr. Varso (Slovakia), Mr. Erwa (Sudan), Mr. Hachani (Tunisia) and Mr. Yel'chenko (Ukraine) took seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation highly appreciates this open debate held under your presidency, Sir. Maintaining international peace and security is the lofty responsibility entrusted to the Council by the Charter of the United Nations, as well as by the vast number of United Nations Member States. Therefore, it is extremely useful for the Council to listen to Member States' views on the major issues of principle concerning international peace and security.

The world is undergoing profound changes at the turn of the century. The desire for peace, stability and development has become the shared understanding and common pursuit of all Member States of this Organization. In regions where war and conflicts persist, such as Africa and Central Asia in particular, putting an end to conflicts at an early date so as to create a secure environment for their socio-economic development has become the international community's top priority, and thus calls for the meaningful support and assistance of the United Nations. The Council's primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security is both unshirkable and irreplaceable.

Today, the Chinese delegation would like to reiterate in particular that it is necessary for the Council to respond positively to the repeated appeals of African countries and to translate its attention to African issues into concrete deeds. The Council should play an especially constructive role in connection with the questions of Somalia, Sierra Leone, the Great Lakes region and so forth. It should take into serious consideration the reasonable requests of Africa, effectively assist and coordinate with African efforts and give active support to regional organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity, that require funds and technical expertise.

In recent years, the Council has become more, rather than less, involved in the internal conflicts of some countries. The Chinese delegation has always held that the Council should strictly adhere to the purposes and principles of the Charter, act upon the consent or request of the country concerned and make every endeavour to help resolve conflicts through peaceful means. We are not in favour of interfering in a country's internal affairs under the pretext of alleviating humanitarian crises or the frequent wielding of military threats or intervention by invoking Chapter VII of the Charter.

The Chinese delegation would like to emphasize here that all multinational military actions authorized by the Council should strictly conform to norms set by the Council and standardize the mechanism of fulfilling responsibilities to the Council, reporting to the Council and accepting the Council's political guidance. China is strongly opposed to any act of power politics that unilaterally resorts to the use or threat of the use of force in international relations while circumventing the Council. In our view, such an act violates international law and the norms governing international relations and is in itself a grave threat to international peace and security.

Maintaining and consolidating peace after conflict requires enormous efforts. In regions where war has just ended, effective support and assistance from the international community are necessary, since the political and security structures in such regions are still delicate and their social economy has been severely damaged. China supports the active involvement of the United Nations system in efforts for peace consolidation and peace-building in post-conflict regions. We would like to make the following three observations in this connection.

First, equal attention should be given to all post-conflict regions. We have noted with concern that certain hot issues have become the focus of attention while others have been unfairly put on the back burner. We see that in some places where there is no longer a threat to international peace and security, United Nations peacekeeping operations are still on the ground, while at the same time other places, such as Africa, which are experiencing much harsher humanitarian and economic situations, are stuck in various difficulties in obtaining capital assistance and United Nations involvement. The Chinese delegation calls for the elimination of such practices of double standards in meting out post-conflict assistance.

Secondly, in the peace consolidation process in post-conflict regions, international efforts should be attuned to the will of the country concerned. The international community should get involved only on the basis of the commitment to maintaining the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the country concerned. The way of development chosen by the people of the country concerned should be respected. Consideration should be given to the most pressing needs of the country concerned: the funds and technical assistance that it needs most in its rehabilitation and development. China has always been opposed to attaching political conditions to assistance, and even more strongly opposed to the practice of using involvement in post-conflict peace-building to promote specific value systems or achieve political ends.

Thirdly, frankly speaking, what is most needed in post-conflict reconstruction is capital and technical assistance. The Chinese delegation maintains that the role and capacity of United Nations organs in the socio-economic field should be strengthened. We are gravely concerned at the marginalization of relevant United Nations functions, including those of the Economic and Social Council, on major international economic development and assistance issues. We are even more strongly opposed to the weakening of the role of United Nations organs in the socio-economic fields, on the one hand, while placing a large load of social issues on the Security Council agenda, on the other. We are not in favour of placing all the problems of all conflict areas in the hands of the Security Council, not least on the ground of the division of work among the various organs of the Organization. That is not good for the normal functioning of other United Nations bodies, including the General Assembly, which is composed of all States Members of the United Nations. At the same time, such practices might affect priorities in the Security Council's work and impair its efficiency. We believe that it would be helpful for the maintenance of international peace and for the promotion of world development if the United Nations and, in particular, the Security Council were to improve its practices with regard to those three elements.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of China for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Recent years have been characterized by an active evolution in the theory and practice of international peacekeeping. This is an objective process. The enormity and complexity of the tasks facing us in that area dictate the need for a constant improvement of the mechanisms for preventing and settling regional crises. The peacekeeping efforts of the international community must be as effective as possible. At the same time, the United Nations Charter, which assigns to the Security Council primary responsibility for and a central role in this very important area, remains the immutable and universal legal basis for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It was precisely on the basis of the United Nations Charter that the fundamental, universally recognized principles of peacekeeping were formed including, first and foremost, ensuring that the Security Council maintained political leadership and control over peacekeeping operations, impartiality, the agreement of the parties and the existence of clearly formulated mandates for those operations, backed by sufficient resources. Precise adherence to those principles in practice is a prerequisite for the success of any peacekeeping operation.

Russia has consistently based its policies on the conviction that the use of force by the international community is an exceptional and extreme measure, to be taken only in cases where a real threat to international peace and security exists under Chapter VII of the Charter and when all political and diplomatic opportunities for the settlement of a conflict have been exhausted. Enforcement peacekeeping operations, which are justified under such conditions, can be implemented only through a decision of the Security Council and under the tight political and appropriate operational control of the Council. This also applies fully to enforcement operations carried out by regional organizations or multinational coalitions, which cannot be deployed without the authorization of the Security Council and which must be transparent and accountable to the Council.

Modern international practice offers quite a few examples of constructive interaction between regional organizations or multinational coalitions and the United Nations in the conduct of peacekeeping operations on various continents, with the Security Council playing the central role. Such a positive practice must be encouraged and strengthened as much as possible.

Against that background, we must express our concern about attempts to make it possible for individual States or coalitions to use force or take enforcement measures without the approval of the Security Council. In that respect, the clearest such attempt can be seen in the drawing up of a new strategic concept of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). According to reports, an idea is being considered to transform NATO into a leading international peacekeeping organization whose actions, which would extend beyond the bounds of the geographic zone for which the Alliance has responsibility, would be taken solely on the basis of its own assessments and decisions, thereby sidestepping the Security Council.

It is clear that we are talking about attempts to replace the Charter-based functions and the prerogatives of the Security Council with unilateral actions taken by regional mechanisms, directly contravening the United Nations Charter. The implementation of such attempts could destabilize and destroy the entire international system, which is founded on the primacy of the United Nations and on international law. We trust that in considering such concepts the relevant States will remember that in addition to being members of a defensive alliance created during the cold-war era, they also bear responsibility, as Members of the United Nations, for respecting the system of collective security enshrined in the Charter.

We are convinced of the need to strengthen the central role of the United Nations in peacekeeping. The resolution of this problem is linked to the development of the potential of the United Nations in the area of rapid crisis response, and Russia supports the efforts undertaken by Member States and by the United Nations Secretariat to enhance the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations and to expand their resource base.

We are open to the possibility of practical cooperation being further developed in this area. The most effective means to achieve that objective remains the system of United Nations stand-by arrangements, which is currently being formulated. We welcome the strategy that is being established at international level for conflict prevention and settlement in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. An important component of this strategy is post-conflict peace-building.

The practice of post-conflict peace-building, which is developing vigorously, is so far raising more questions than it is providing answers, but it has become clear that without effective efforts in this area it will be impossible to reliably establish necessary conditions for the non-resumption of conflicts.

A number of concrete peace-building tasks, such as disarmament, the demobilization and reintegration into peaceful life of armed parties included in conflicts and demining are sometimes included in the mandates of multifunctional peacekeeping operations conducted under Security Council mandates. In practice, a smooth transition is thereby ensured from the peacekeeping stage to the following phase of post-conflict peace-building. On the whole, however, post-conflict peace-building represents a fully independent aspect of that complex peacekeeping strategy, and usually provides for the implementation of large-scale, long-term and often expensive projects that go beyond the bounds of peacekeeping operations. In concentrating primarily on a solution to the social, economic and humanitarian tasks of recovery, peace-building for the most part falls within the sphere of competence of the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies of the United Nations system, which must work in close contact with other international financial, economic and humanitarian Organizations, in particular in providing material and financial resources for peace-building activities.

In this context, we attach great significance to the reactivation of Article 65 of the Charter with regard to the Economic and Social Council's provision of information and assistance to the Security Council. This chapter of the Charter is also fully applicable on the preventive level, insofar as the Security Council can and must draw the attention of the Economic and Social Council to the relevant problems of various regions, as the Security Council, within the framework of its competence, closely follows destabilizing trends in the social, economic and humanitarian fields that which can lead to the emergence or escalation of conflicts.

The indispensable political role in the sphere of post-conflict peace-building must be carried out by the General Assembly by, *inter alia*, defining the basic framework and criteria for activity in that area, including abidance by the fundamental principle of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Such interaction of the Security Council with other major United Nations organs is fully in keeping with the Charter and with the task of strengthening and improving coordination within the framework of the United Nations system. We are ready for constructive work in this area so that the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter can be activated.

Mr. Burleigh (United States of America): It is a pleasure to see you in the Chair, Mr. President.

In the last several years, a new type of threat to international peace and security has come into prominence. It often emanates not from external dangers but from internal crises that destabilize a State and risk drawing its neighbours into a downward spiral of collapse and conflict.

In a number of cases, opposing sides in such countries have signed peace accords that led to United Nations peacekeeping operations to help the parties implement the accords. Unlike traditional peacekeeping operations, whose principal objective was to monitor and report on a ceasefire, these peacekeeping operations have had multifaceted tasks — for example, in the mandates for past operations in Cambodia, Mozambique and Rwanda and in a number of the United Nations peacekeeping operations under way today.

Members of such peacekeeping operations have been called upon, *inter alia*, to provide security, monitor police, prepare for elections and monitor respect for human rights. To accomplish these tasks, the missions have included sizeable civilian as well as large military components, with the civilian members involved in activities that would contribute to a lasting peace after the peacekeepers left. In nine of the current 16 peacekeeping operations, the services of civilian police are required to help meet public security challenges in such countries as Bosnia, Haiti, Angola and the Central African Republic. Indeed, civilian police now comprise about 20 per cent of all peacekeeping forces.

Some of the above tasks, however, may go beyond peacekeeping to the area of peace-building, a transition that we in the United Nations need to understand and manage better.

In terms of this transition from peacekeeping to peace-building, we see three sets of concerns — the division of labour between peacekeeping and peace-building; resources; and coordination.

First, the division of labour between peacekeeping and peace-building: Where should the line be drawn?

Peacekeeping mandates need to include some short-term activities that will enhance the ability of peacekeeping troops, military observers and/or civilian police to stabilize the immediate situation and maintain the momentum for peace. These activities would include steps such as demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of combatants, and demining. They may also include providing support for elections or short-term support for public security institutions through monitoring and mentoring of local police.

However, longer-term support to rebuild or restructure basic public security institutions, such as police, prisons and the judiciary, fall beyond the scope of peacekeeping and into the area of peace-building. Admittedly, there is a "twilight zone" between peacekeeping and peace-building, and it will not always be possible to draw a clear distinction. Judgements will need to be made. In addition, while some peace-building activities might occur only after a peacekeeping operation ends, they also might well be part of the peace accord which the peacekeeping mission is intended to support.

In any case, both the United Nations and the host Government need to focus early on longer-term peace-building tasks and seek the appropriate domestic, multilateral, and bilateral backing for them. Ideally, the Security Council should work out with the host Government a timetable for accomplishing specific objectives in peace-building to contribute to the stability which the peacekeeping operations help provide.

Secondly, resources. Investing in peace-building is investing for the future stability and prosperity of a country that has suffered the ravages of conflict. Countries that seek peacekeeping support from the international community need to recognize that it is just as important for them to marshal resources to secure the peace — through peace-building — as it was to marshal resources for conflict in the first place. United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, bilateral donors — and, perhaps most important, the host countries themselves — need to understand that devoting a share of limited resources to furthering good governance will help create a climate in which economic growth can occur. Without stability, security, the rule of law and respect for human rights, resources spent on development will yield little fruit. And without the clear engagement of the host country in achieving these objectives, outside assistance will ultimately fail.

On one thing we can easily agree — that the United Nations itself will never have adequate resources to do the enormous job that serious peace-building entails. But it can play an important role as coordinator of the United Nations system and the international community as well.

So the third concern we must address is coordination. Coordinating peacekeeping and peace-building activities and moving a country from conflict to peace-building requires strong leadership. As determined by the Security Council, this political leadership can be provided by a special representative of the Secretary-General, a special coordinator, a transitional administrator or other high representative of the Secretary-General. It will be particularly important to clarify lines of authority among the United Nations agencies involved to establish the basis for full cooperation.

Whatever the title of the individual, he or she will need to interact credibly with heads of Governments and representatives of United Nations agencies, the World Bank, regional development banks, international financial institutions and other organizations contributing to peace-building resources. Civil society, the private sector and non-governmental organizations are likewise an important part of this mix. From experience in countries like Liberia, we know it is important for humanitarian and development assistance donors across the board to get involved in peace-building early, to coordinate closely and to share experiences from previous endeavours.

The United States welcomes the renewed interest in post-conflict peace-building, and commends you, our President, for taking the initiative to organize today's discussion.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Niehaus (Costa Rica) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I should like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for your decision, Mr. President, to convene this open meeting of the Security Council to consider the question of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. Your initiative is a step in the right direction of promoting transparency and the participation of all Member States in the work of the Security Council. It is also significant encouragement for this principal body of our Organization to have a wide-ranging and democratic discussion of a topic that has become essential to its principal function of maintaining international peace and security.

Since the end of the cold war the international community has simultaneously taken part in and witnessed an accelerated process of broadening the concepts, contents and interpretation of the multilateral peace and security agenda. In less than 10 years our Organization has gone beyond the limited and limiting interpretation that prevailed in the previous stage of hegemonic confrontation as regards the scope of that terminology and its operational consequences.

For 45 years after the establishment of the United Nations, a restrictive interpretation of the scope of the responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, given by Member States to the Security Council and set forth in paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Charter, restricted multilateral action to monitoring and verifying compliance with agreements on the cessation of hostilities between two or more States. The internal logic of the super-Power rivalry justified the adoption in both the work and the practice of the Security Council of this self-limitation, which was removed from reality and, as some have said, reduced the Council's principal function to the bare minimum, to the detriment of, and ignoring, the will of the founding fathers of 1945.

Since 1989, as I have stated we seen the traditional concept replaced or enlarged, depending on one's point of view; a slow process has begun of devising and assimilating a broadened interpretation of the content and scope of "the maintenance of international peace and security".

It was in the context of this new vision of international relations that the Secretary-General, at the Council's request, outlined in the Agenda for Peace, published in 1992, the five major action areas where he thought the United Nations should be able to use the powers given it by the Charter on these fundamental matters in the new and changing international arena. The Secretary-General included in that innovative agenda the concept of post-conflict peace-building as a specific area of action for the United Nations, designed to put together and regulate all the measures to consolidate cooperation between parties, national or international, that previously had been pitted against one another, and to develop the social, economic, juridical and political infrastructure needed to prevent a return to violence and to lay down bases for sustainable and lasting peace.

As a result, we could and should say that peace-building is not a whimsical invention or an unfounded political proposal; rather, it is a deep-rooted concept with sufficient juridical and political legitimacy to become a subject to which the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, must give attention.

Today, the great majority of Members of the United Nations agree that the restricted concept I have mentioned has been superseded and that we have now evolved into the second stage outlined at the beginning of the decade. In truth, what six years ago seemed a mere intellectual discussion has now become a reality and is gradually being included in the new doctrine being implemented by the United Nations and, more concretely, the Security Council with regard to international peace and security.

This evolution, which has brought us to a "second generation" in the maintenance of peace and security, has not occurred in a vacuum, and, as always happens, is a response to reality itself.

Thus, the new vision, which is both wide-ranging and integral, corresponds to a set of needs which, although they have existed for some time, received attention and were included in the new concept of the maintenance of international peace and security with the end of the cold war. But it also corresponds to what could be described as a new set of potentials and possibilities that emerged after 1989.

In that connection, the majority of conflicts that pose a threat to international peace and security indisputably involve political, economic and social situations that, once the strictly military aspects are resolved, require responses and solutions that are in keeping with their specific characteristics. In the light of this broad vision, therefore, the response of the international community to these new crises must incorporate the various aspects of the specific situations in a complete and multidisciplinary manner. In our view, it must address and resolve a number of particular factors.

First of all, we must note that the concept of peace-building is part of a set of realities and a link in the long chain of the maintenance of international peace and security. Peace-building presupposes that in every case the military dimension of an armed conflict has already been resolved through a cessation of hostilities and the adoption of agreements on the demobilization of combatants. It is true that although the underlying causes of a conflict go beyond the question of the war itself, the truth is that it is nearly impossible to move on to addressing those underlying causes if the armed struggle has not ceased and if the fate of combatants has not been determined. In other words, it is hard to imagine peace-building in isolation without the prior stages of negotiations — political or diplomatic, depending on the case — and of agreement on a ceasefire.

Secondly, Costa Rica has learned from its own regional experience that truly effective peace-building requires agreements and consensus among the parties to the conflict, and, although a ceasefire and demobilization are needed as a first step, must also include specific arrangements tailored to the various structural matters as well as to other issues — such as the existence of a State based on the rule of law, legal security and the enjoyment of human rights — which were at the root of the conflict. Here, we cannot fail to mention the experiences of El Salvador, Haiti and Guatemala, which have shown how fundamental the concept of an integral approach is to the achievement of a solid, lasting peace.

The third element is closely linked to the first two: the existence of genuine commitment by the parties to the conflict is a *sine qua non*. It may seem self-evident, but let me add that it is indispensable, once a ceasefire has been put in place, to ensure that agreements on structural matters are sustainable.

Fourthly, the facts have shown that agreements comprising an integral response to today's international or national conflicts must include effective efforts at political and diplomatic negotiations. Peace does not emerge from nothing. Those same tough and valuable facts also point to the potential of resources for peaceful solutions as the ideal tools for conflict resolution. In that sphere, regional and multilateral organizations, since the end of the cold war, have proven to be the ideal forums for addressing and overcoming these crises.

The cases of Central America, Namibia, Cambodia, Mozambique and, most recently, the Central African Republic show how facilitation, good offices and mediation by international organizations and regional bodies have become effective tools for resolving conflicts and achieving solid, lasting peace agreements.

Fifthly, the acknowledged need for comprehensive agreements containing specific solutions to the various problems that lie at the root of conflicts has given rise to a comprehensive and multidisciplinary involvement by the various elements of international organizations, notably the United Nations, and by non-governmental organizations, both in defining these responses and in participating actively in their implementation. Here, the experience in Bosnia and Herzegovina has become a benchmark.

That is one very important aspect of this new vision of peace-building. It is, in fact, a question that elicits varying opinions not only on basic matters but also on the operational implications for the United Nations. Some have expressed reasonable doubts in this connection, feeling that the peace-building stage, by its very nature and by transcending and overcoming purely military matters, has become something that has more to do with other areas of international action, such as development cooperation. From the traditional viewpoint in keeping with the old logic of the days before 1989, this is, strictly speaking, true. But a new vision of the concepts of international peace and security, such as that which we share, should enable us to agree to incorporate the post-conflict stage in this broader view of the question.

Clearly, discussion of many of these matters is ongoing and continues to reflect divergent views on matters such as the role of the Security Council in this process and its links with other organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations system — although the differences in these views are narrowing. But my delegation considers that these very facts show that in the present circumstances it is illogical to insist on retaining limited and separate areas of competence for the various parts of the Organization and, above all, that there is no political sense in trying to circumscribe the concepts of international peace and security or to strip them of their meaning.

Costa Rica wishes to put forward a few points as food for thought:

Peace-building is a political concept within the broader perspective of the maintenance of international peace and security, although it can have specialized technical implications.

Peace-building must be viewed from an integral perspective. In other words, it is illogical to make it unilateral or to reduce its content to one or several of its elements.

Peace-building, as an integral and integrating concept, requires broad, multidisciplinary involvement by the international community.

Peace-building requires the acceptance and inclusion of specific areas for action by multilateral organizations on questions that were once reserved for domestic jurisdiction with respect to bolstering the State based on the rule of law. These include political watchfulness, the preparation and monitoring of elections, training and modernization in the judiciary and, most important, the promotion of and respect for all human rights.

Peace-building also requires the acceptance of special treatment for societies that have recently overcome armed conflicts and that must reconstruct their basic infrastructure. This has special implications in terms of the participation of the international financial institutions and of their relationship with such countries.

Let me conclude Costa Rica's contribution to this meeting by reaffirming our firm belief that it is vitally necessary to accept these concepts and to incorporate them in the agenda and practice of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular. If we want to guarantee the effectiveness of our work in keeping with our Charter obligations, and if we are truly committed to meeting today's great challenges in order to ensure a peaceful and secure world for all, we must be able to find correct, appropriate and effective answers.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Costa Rica for the kind words he addressed to me. Allow me to note that Costa Rica's participation in the work of the Council has been extremely effective.

Mr. Dejammet (France) (*interpretation from French*): The report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and its supplement stressed the importance of peace-building and proposed guidelines in that connection. The Security Council responded by endorsing assessments of the report in the statement made by the President of the Council on 30 April 1993, document S/25696. The Secretary-General's reform process and his report on Africa (S/1998/318), which the Council discussed on 24 September 1998, provided an opportunity to resume the debate on peace-building and to make a number of proposals.

Activities which can assist in peace-building are by nature highly varied, but they all are aimed at strengthening confidence and improving the living conditions in countries afflicted by conflicts in order to prevent the resurgence of violence and to create conditions for a lasting peace. Each situation is unique, and it would thus be presumptuous — even given this general debate in the Council — to try a priori to define the content of such peace-building activities. Nevertheless, on the basis of past and present experience, three major categories have been singled out.

The first of these categories is the strengthening of confidence and national reconciliation, which in many cases covers the return and reintegration of refugees, the demobilization and reintegration of combatants and the development of dialogue between the former parties to the conflict, as well as respect for human rights.

The second category is that of economic reconstruction, which most often includes humanitarian assistance to cope with emergency needs and also rehabilitation or the establishment of economic and social infrastructure, including in the educational system. Demining is also a very important element of this aspect.

Finally, the third category, which is part of peace-building, consists in the recreation of institutions — political institutions — which in many cases have been damaged or indeed destroyed by the conflict. The objective is to achieve good governance. This includes assistance in organizing free and democratic elections, the reconstruction and strengthening of State structures, in particular, but not only, in such sectors of sovereignty as justice and the police. Finally, and above all, this often includes, or should include, learning to share power.

Recent thinking has demonstrated that, aside from these different guidelines, there also was a need to attach specific importance to appropriate disarmament measures. In many cases, parties to the conflict have built up major weapons stocks which can contribute to a resumption of hostilities or can be disseminated in an uncontrolled fashion, thereby endangering the security of the region. In this regard, France welcomes the decision of the Secretary-General to emphasize the problem of light weapons and small-calibre weapons and their illegal trafficking, most particularly in Africa. We know that Mali originally made proposals on this subject which are now in the process of implementation. Peace-building in regions of the African continent which have been devastated by conflicts indeed hinges on decisive action to cope with the dissemination of light weapons and small-calibre weapons.

The prevention of the resumption of conflicts which the Security Council deals with or has dealt with is obviously a continuing concern. All too often, international attention dwindles once the acute crisis period has passed and once the media have focused interest elsewhere. Then the parties to the conflict, the United Nations, some countries which are more vigilant than others or present in the field must cope with the enormous task of peace-building, and this involves the medium- and long-term mobilization of all necessary means.

This is why it is important for the Security Council to take into account in advance the aspects of peace-building so that they might be integrated into a comprehensive and sure strategy for the necessary financing. Therefore, these aspects must be duly provided for within the mandate which defines a peacekeeping operation when that operation is decided upon. That mandate forms the framework for action by the United Nations and the international community.

When there is no peacekeeping operation, or after it has been completed, peace-building activities which are deemed necessary to launch or to continue should then be the subject of the appropriate agreements between the country or countries involved, on the one hand, and the various protagonists who can contribute — that is, United

Nations programmes and agencies, regional organizations, donor countries and non-governmental organizations — on the other.

But all of this, I repeat, in no way eliminates the importance and even the necessity of anticipating, at the outset of thinking on a peacekeeping operation, the peace-building activities which then must follow so that we can have a general and understandable overview, and especially so that we have an idea of the necessary financing. That having been stated, the success of peace-building depends on the will of the parties to the conflict to really put an end to hostilities as much as on the mobilization of the international community.

Experience has shown that three stumbling blocks must be avoided.

First of all, there is the competition between the protagonists and the temptation to go it alone. Close coordination is indispensable to ensure that all of the activities involved in fact are aimed at the stated objective. Redundancies, duplications, even contradictions represent a waste of very meagre resources. The special representative of the Secretary-General, therefore, has a pivotal role to play in ensuring coordination and avoiding overlapping and wastage; moreover, promising experience has been acquired in this area.

A second stumbling block, the lack of continuity between the different stages of international action after a conflict, can do major damage to the effectiveness of peace-building actions, in particular following the completion of an operation's mandate. An appropriate transition must be planned in order to avoid an interruption of programmes or the substitution in emergency situations of new partners who have a different approach from that which had been followed previously. I repeat, the Security Council must have this element in mind when it decides on the ending of an operation.

Finally — and this is the third stumbling block — the temptation to impose artificial and predetermined models in the various activity sectors for peace-building on the countries or parties involved must be fought off. If we wish these programmes to succeed and to achieve the established objectives, then they should be developed in a spirit of respect for diversity of the needs and characteristics of each country, such as cultural characteristics, and linguistic characteristics in particular. Otherwise, there are real risks of rejection and ultimately failure.

The maintenance of peace and the solution of conflicts hinge on an integrated approach to all aspects involved. It would be erroneous to isolate the military dimension from the other aspects, be they economic, social, cultural or institutional. The numerous crises which the Security Council has dealt with over the last few years are no longer exclusively classic inter-State conflicts but are very often — indeed most often — complex internal conflicts. Therefore, there is a need for approaches to include, as much as possible, all the dimensions. It is in this context that the activities of peace-building must be taken into account, planned for in advance by the Security Council.

This is the reason why we wish to thank you, Sir, for having convened this debate. I think that we will be more and more aware of this need to deal with the fundamental aspects of peace-building from the very outset of a crisis.

Mr. Monteiro (Portugal): It is with keen interest and great satisfaction that Portugal welcomes this thematic consideration by the Security Council of the importance of post-conflict peace-building activities in keeping and consolidating peace and security. We very much congratulate you, Sir, for organizing this debate.

The statement to be made later on by the Austrian Presidency of the European Union fully reflects our thinking on this matter, and I wish merely to add to and elaborate further on a number of points.

It is particularly gratifying for my delegation to participate in this debate today, since it was last year, during the first Portuguese presidency of the Security Council in April 1997, that we raised the issue of peace-building in a peacekeeping context. At that time, we recommended a discussion by the Council in order to identify those short-term activities — strictly speaking, post-conflict peace-building activities — which were essential to the functioning and, ultimately, the success of peacekeeping operations. Much work had been done by Germany in this respect in helping to define problematic areas, and we felt it was time for the Council itself to address the issue, especially where it had a direct impact on the elaboration of mandates and the very structure of the peacekeeping operations established by the Council. Unfortunately, it was not possible to hold the discussion at that time, but we wholeheartedly welcome its realization here today. This is an important debate which will help the United Nations trace the major lines of current thinking on the interplay between peace-building activities and the immediate task of maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

In the increasingly multidisciplinary United Nations peacekeeping operations, particularly those involved in addressing intra-State conflicts, a number of peace-building activities have already been needed during the operational life of those peacekeeping operations as well as after their conclusion. The fact is that certain long-term tasks must be started early, even immediately following a ceasefire, and these are often foreseen in the elaboration of peace agreements.

These activities include the demobilization and disarmament of fighting forces; the transformation of armed movements into civil political parties; the reintegration of former combatants into society; the restructuring and unification of police and armed forces and ensuring that in their conduct, all forces meet international human rights standards; the return of refugees and displaced persons; demining programmes; support for political and legal institutions geared towards national reconciliation; and the holding of elections.

The successful conclusion of a peace process in situations of intra-State conflict is premised on national reconciliation, which in turn cannot be achieved without safeguarding the rights of individuals. Not only must their humanitarian and human rights be rigorously protected and upheld, but they must also be given a chance to secure their socio-economic well-being.

In today's peacekeeping, these are on many occasions fully mandated tasks and often make up the main work of the peacekeepers. And rightly so, since without them the recurrence of conflict is not only possible but likely. They act to remove immediate focuses of tension and other factors of destabilization that may threaten the peace process and its implementation.

These are the lessons which have been learned by the United Nations in a number of peacekeeping operations and are now being applied in the Central African Republic, in Liberia, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and elsewhere.

The strong link between peace-building activities and the immediate goals of establishing and maintaining peace and security was particularly evident in Mozambique, in the work of the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ). The careful deployment and effective coordination of peacekeeping and peace-building components secured the successful consolidation of the peace process in Mozambique, which today continues rightly to be supported by the international community.

While peacekeeping operations still focus primarily on the military aspects of a peace agreement, the fact is that peace-building activities are increasingly important in ensuring the timely and full implementation of the terms of peace agreements and the fulfilment of peacekeeping mandates.

Peace-building is thus essential in the peacekeeping phase. Peace-building may be post-conflict but it is not, nor should it be, post-peacekeeping. It is important to make this point, since the proper use of peace-building activities in good time, before the end of peacekeeping mandates, will help bridge the transitional gap that inevitably appears between the withdrawal of the peacekeepers and the effective functioning of development activities which address the long-term causes of conflict. In this so-called twilight zone, conflict can erupt again very easily unless steps have been taken to disarm and demobilize, to find relevant occupations for ex-fighters and to help the wider process of national reconciliation through a participatory political process, including democratic elections.

Therefore, quite apart from their intrinsic value, peace-building activities in a peacekeeping context also seem to be sensible, sound insurance policies to secure the investments of the international community in bringing peace to conflict situations.

We welcome the increased attention given to this important dynamic by the Secretary-General, as evident in his report on the causes of conflict in Africa. While peace-building tasks are usually predetermined in the peace agreements which bring the fighting to an end and are subsequently integrated into the mandates of peacekeeping operations by the Security Council, it is up to the Secretary-General to ensure the effective coordination on the ground of all the activities of the various components of the operations so that they function in a complementary and coordinated fashion, thereby contributing to the consolidation of the peace process. For this to happen in optimal conditions, there should be a clear leadership and coordination structure on the ground, headed by his Special Representative, whose task is to deploy appropriately all those components at his or her disposal to ensure the stability of the peace process. Such flexibility should also include financial means.

Portugal also agrees with the Secretary-General that curtailing the availability of small arms in a post-conflict situation is a very important activity to reduce tensions and prevent the resumption of hostilities.

In this process of peacekeeping and peace-building, it is also essential to ensure the greatest degree possible of coordination among the efforts of the organs of the United Nations — the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council — and those of the United Nations programmes and agencies and the international financial and development institutions, as well as bilateral aid efforts. This will not only avoid duplication and overlap but also optimize the material and human investments in peace of the United Nations. An important role in this area is also played by non-governmental organizations.

In the wider realm of the maintenance of international peace and security, we have seen an important and appropriate division of labour with regional organizations, as foreseen in Chapter VIII of the Charter. We welcome this trend and, in this context, it is important also to identify the peace-building activities within peacekeeping that can benefit from an effective cooperation with regional organizations. A case in point, we believe, is Guinea-Bissau, which will require the careful attention of the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, and the continued excellent cooperation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries (CPLP) in helping to establish the foundations for a long-lasting peace.

The present and future of United Nations peacekeeping is strongly based on the experiences of the past. Initially, experience indicated a need for larger and more comprehensive operations which sought to address each and every aspect of a conflict. Subsequently, a more realistic and efficient approach has been taken, tailored to each situation but still recognizing the need to expand the definition of peacekeeping tasks to include peace-building activities. This dynamic development of peacekeeping is the most effective use of the resources of the United Nations in the exercise of its responsibilities in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Portugal for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Jagne (Gambia): In his widely acclaimed report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa", the Secretary-General defined post-conflict peace-building as

> "actions undertaken at the end of a conflict to consolidate peace and prevent a recurrence of armed confrontation". (*S/1998/318, para. 63*)

Since the absence of conflict does not necessarily mean the prevalence of peace, the consolidation process for the restoration of durable peace should start almost immediately — and we cannot agree more that time is of the essence. With the help of the rest of the international community — coupled with the required degree of political will — reintegration, rehabilitation and reconstruction programmes should be put in place as quickly as possible. This is one way of creating confidence-building measures that in turn could facilitate efforts geared towards national reconciliation.

This presupposes, of course, that, should there be a large number of refugees and displaced persons, the priority of priorities would be to ensure their safe repatriation and resettlement, with special attention given to women, children and the elderly.

It will be recalled that a few months ago, when we discussed a related topic — I am referring to the question of "Children and armed conflict" — Ambassador Olara Otunnu spoke at length on post-conflict peace-building and his plans to set up a pilot project in Sierra Leone for this purpose.

In neighbouring Liberia the first United Nations Peace-building Support Office has been established, and we can learn a lot from the experience acquired there to establish similar offices elsewhere. A United Nations presence, no matter how symbolic, always provides a feeling of security for the local populations, and, by extension, it has a salutary effect on confidence-building measures generally.

For all intents and purposes, the success of any peace-building programme depends to a large extent on the availability of resources. This is why a concerted and coordinated effort is indispensable for the effective mobilization of the necessary domestic and international resources.

In addition to the basic short-term peace-building programmes, there should be a sustained effort to support medium- and long-term programmes as well — such as the strengthening of national institutions, monitoring elections, the protection and promotion of human rights, good governance and so on and so forth.

This is all fine, but the crux of the matter is to address with equal zeal the question of sustainable development. Experience has shown that widespread poverty breeds conflict. It is difficult to envisage how democracy, good governance, the rule of law and respect for human rights can flourish in conditions of abject poverty. In order to achieve durable peace, the people must first be empowered. Then there will be no need to take up arms again.

Mr. Essonghé (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The Council is meeting today to discuss the essential subject of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building.

This debate, if it needs to be recalled, is inspired by one of the relevant questions addressed in the important report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa. In holding this debate, the Security Council wished to promote reflection on the activities and role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, most particularly in the area of peace-building.

Since the first peacekeeping operation, 50 years ago, the United Nations has considerably improved its methods and strategies in this area, despite the shortcomings that have been noted in some cases. This evolution is due to the emergence of new kinds of conflicts and the desire to achieve greater effectiveness in United Nations interventions.

Thus, after the cold-war period the United Nations devised and began undertaking multidimensional peacekeeping operations, the role of which is to monitor the implementation of the often complex peace agreements between Governments and dissident political movements. We would like to commend the realism and pragmatism shown by the United Nations, particularly in Africa, where the Organization has undertaken 13 of the 33 peacekeeping missions it has conducted throughout the world. The example of United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA) is an illustration of this new type of operation.

For its part, Africa, in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, has — particularly by means of regional and subregional arrangements — undertaken with remarkable success courageous peacekeeping missions in Liberia, Sierra Leone and, recently, in Guinea-Bissau.

Peacekeeping is not an end in itself. This is why we welcome the combination in these new types of operations of conventional peacekeeping tasks with political and humanitarian activities, as noted in a joint study of the International Peace Academy and the Organization of African Unity. This new approach to settling conflicts is a commendable innovation leading to post-conflict peace-building, which is the most critical stage in securing progress in the restoration and maintenance of peace. Indeed, without peace-building the efforts to achieve lasting settlements of conflicts remain superficial, fragile and precarious, because the causes and roots of the conflicts are not addressed.

In his 13 April 1998 report on the situation regarding conflicts in Africa, the Secretary-General defined post-conflict peace-building as:

> "actions undertaken at the end of a conflict to consolidate peace and prevent a recurrence of armed confrontation". (*S/1998/318, para. 63*)

These actions must be integrated and coordinated measures directed at eliminating the deep-seated causes of the violence, whatever their nature. Post-conflict peace-building must thus be considered a long-term strategy. Accordingly, we welcome the comprehensive measures that were adopted within the framework of the conflict settlement in the Central African Republic, where the United Nations Mission formulated a number of measures that took into consideration the most essential political, security and economic priorities. Specifically, MINURCA, together with other partners, proposed and recommended certain steps for rehabilitating the political landscape, security forces and the economy.

We should, however, also recall and consider here the role of the United Nations bodies, each in its own area of competence. While the Security Council is mandated by statute with the maintenance of international peace and security, tasks involving measures related to peace-building in areas such as human rights, refugees or development fall within the purview of other United Nations bodies. It would also be desirable if peacekeeping and peace-building operations could be conducted within the strict framework of agreement and coordination, in harmony with the country concerned, and with scrupulous respect for that country's sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity.

During the first few meetings of the ad hoc Working Group established by resolution 1170 (1998), the Group was not able to reach a consensus on including post-conflict peace-building on its list of priority topics for discussion. Some delegations considered the question a complex one that did not fall within the purview of the Security Council. Others, on the basis of experience gained — particularly in the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia and MINURCA — maintained that the Council did have a role to play in post-conflict peace-building.

While emphasizing the limits of the authority of each organ of the United Nations, my delegation believes that good harmonization and proper coordination could give the Council the role of counsellor in post-conflict peace-building.

Mr. Amorim (Brazil): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, as others have done, for organizing this debate on a very important subject.

Indeed, as I was reflecting on the very title of the agenda item for the debate, I thought that something was lacking, namely, the word "international". The title of this agenda item speaks about the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. I thought that omission was not so serious because, in reality, it could just be implicit — as, for instance, some of the titles of the Articles and Chapters of the Charter speak of threats to peace, breaches of peace and so on. But, of course, the word "international" was clearly implicit when the Charter was written. In other Articles — such as Article 33, which has to do with the maintenance of peace, the subject with which we are dealing today — the word "international" appears very clearly. But, as I said, it might have just been a question of omitting a word that is implicit.

However, after having listened to some of the interventions, I think that the moment might indeed come when we could consider the interplay between internal and international conflicts, because that in itself is an important matter, and it is not without consequence. For instance, we have heard today — as we have heard several times outside this debate — that we are currently seeing increasing numbers of internal conflicts and that such is the nature of the conflicts we are having to face. Well, I do not think that statement is completely accurate. To begin with — and if you wish we could even go back to the French Revolution or even further — many of the conflicts of the past have been conflicts of an internal nature that have in some way or other became international. So there is nothing new about that — at least nothing extremely new.

On the other hand, many of the conflicts that we are still dealing with today are clearly international, such as the very important question of the Middle East. But even some other conflicts that we tend to treat as internal conflicts are really outgrowths of international conflicts. This is very clearly the situation in Angola, which is an issue that we have been trying to deal with here in the Council without much real success. This is really a conflict situation that is largely an outgrowth of the cold war. In fact, the existence and activities of at least one of the parties to that conflict are maintained largely due to the role it played at a certain stage of the cold war.

So I think that this clear distinction, as if we had moved from an era of international conflicts to an era of internal conflicts, is a subject to which we should devote a lot of attention and which should perhaps be the subject of a future debate. This is also important with relation to peace-building; and I will come to that in a moment. If we think of peace-building as also being a result of efforts to contain or solve internal conflicts, then I think the Security Council may be tempted to become a kind of resurrected Trusteeship Council. I believe that is a temptation that it should resist.

I therefore think, as several of my colleagues have already said, that when we deal with other aspects of these situations — such as economic and social aspects — we should pay attention to the appropriate competencies of other organs. And even if these countries do need some assistance in terms of good governance and internal political stability, I think we should be very careful as to how far we wish to take the action of the Security Council.

Pardon my digression, which was not in my prepared statement, but I think it was motivated by the tenor of the discussion, which is indeed a very interesting one and which can even motivate further discussions of the Council in the future.

Moments of discontinuity such as the world has experienced since 1989 can present Governments and institutions with particularly complex challenges. With the end of bipolarity, the potential for improved multilateral cooperation in the promotion of peace was hailed across the globe. The Security Council met at the summit level in January 1992 to celebrate its reconquered unity and entrusted the Secretary-General with the task of defining a United Nations response to a new and promising emerging order. The "Agenda for Peace" and its supplement, cited here by Ambassador Dejammet, provided the Organization with a new lexicon. They had an unquestionable impact on the thinking within the Organization and beyond. The prospects for a new international consensus in dealing with conflict opened up encouraging possibilities for the establishment of a world system founded on justice and democracy, with the United Nations Charter at its centre. The Security Council seemed destined for a historic role in ensuring our transition to a safer world.

And yet, as we approach the end of the millennium, it appears that some in-depth thinking is required if we are to draw all the necessary lessons from a period of intense Security Council activity. At the end of a year that has witnessed the outbreak of new crises and a deterioration of several persisting conflicts, it does not seem possible for the Security Council to proceed much longer without scrutinizing its own performance. Whether or not we have reached a point where a new Security Council summit is called for is an open question, and one which we surely do not want to address today. However, we should not wait for the fractures in the Council's consensus to develop into cracks or gaps before reassessing our strengths and weaknesses.

According to a commentary published in a weekly magazine in the United States a few months ago, "the world hasn't looked this scary since the cold war". The renowned editor of *Foreign Affairs* has made a similar observation, to the effect that the post-cold-war era has ended, and with it the illusion that the entire world would be destined for conditions of rising wealth and stability in which war seemed absurd.

In a world of constant and often perplexing change it is fundamental to preserve the Security Council's authority to act in the maintenance of peace and security. Innovative ideas and policies have to be judged by this litmus test. We are not against change. We have been among the strongest advocates in the Organization for a reform of the Security Council. But at the same time, we view with uneasiness certain attempts currently being made that could undermine the foundations of collective security as defined by the Charter.

The United Nations has developed a valuable capacity to deal with international crises and threats to peace. At a time of transition such as ours, the need for global institutions is greater than ever. National Governments, no matter how powerful they may be individually or in the context of restricted groups, cannot legitimately aspire to promote a more peaceful world on their own while ignoring the views of the broader international community. True multilateralism on a global scale is and will remain the best model for international cooperation for the years to come.

A blueprint for enhancing the Security Council's authority should necessarily include a review of recent experience in the field of peacekeeping. Improvements in the Organization's rapid deployment capacity should continue to be sought through more open and transparent discussions. So-called "robust" operations have been tried successfully in specific circumstances, as in the case of Eastern Slavonia. It is important to recall, however, that, although established under Chapter VII, the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) did enjoy the consent of the parties and, in that respect, did not deviate from the general peacekeeping doctrine which has evolved since the days of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) and which remains the only acceptable basis for the deployment of United Nations peacekeepers.

As illustrated in the report *Words to Deeds: Strengthening the U.N.'s Enforcement Capabilities*, prepared by representatives from a variety of countries and backgrounds, there is a growing perception that the shortcomings of our present machinery for ensuring compliance with Security Council resolutions need to be seriously addressed. The *Words to Deeds* Task Force, which was ably chaired by Lord Carrington, was uncompromising, however, in its reaffirmation of the primacy of the Security Council as the sole body with legal authority to mandate enforcement actions. Likewise, it sustained that, in considering enforcement options, the use of military force should be considered only as a last resort. In addition, it stated that, when the use of force is seriously contemplated, it is preferable to do so through multilateral means. We fully subscribe to such views.

The fact that the United Nations has not, to this day, put into effect its original architecture for military enforcement might give rise to regret or relief, depending on the point of view. However, this should neither encourage Member States to look for unorthodox solutions in defiance of the Charter, on the one hand, nor prevent us from considering the matter in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, for that matter.

The founders of the United Nations envisioned a partnership between the world body and regional arrangements and organizations. As everybody knows, this is even enshrined in Chapter VIII of the Charter. Regional global burden-sharing would in principle make as much sense for enforcement as it can make for peacekeeping. Moreover, regional initiatives can be particularly effective in the preventive or post-conflict phases of stabilization efforts.

Unfortunately, however, numerous actions of doubtful conformity with existing rules have taken place lately. Without going into the motives of such attitudes, which may have been legitimate in themselves and even have their goals shared by many countries, the fact remains that overt violations of sanctions regimes, or armed interventions and manifestations of readiness to use armed force by regional actors without the specific authority of the Security Council, raise serious legal as well as political questions. Enforcement interventions with no clear legal foundation will lack moral authority and will not be able to meet with the approval of world opinion in the long run.

For some time, we have been concerned with the absence of a satisfactory intergovernmental mechanism for dealing with countries coming out of conflict. Frequently, the most dire needs of such countries extend far beyond the security aspects and require efforts in the realm of economic and social development or institution-building. Haiti is a case in point, and perhaps soon the Central African Republic will be another, to cite just two examples.

The Secretary-General has recognized the importance of promoting new forms of cooperation between the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in his latest report on the work of the Organization. As Ambassador Lavrov recalled, Article 65 of the Charter has been quoted by the Secretary-General as providing a basis for achieving better communication and coordination between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Security Council resolution 1212 (1998), adopted less than a month ago, set the stage, in an innovative way, for placing the situation in Haiti within a different context by inviting United Nations bodies and agencies, especially the Economic and Social Council — and I want to underline that — to contribute to the designing of a long-term programme of support for this least developed country of the Caribbean. It is now up to the Economic and Social Council to take up this challenging task.

Many of the situations that have found their way onto the Security Council's agenda involve very poor developing countries, whose struggle to heal the wounds left by conflicts often receive much less attention than the scenes of violence depicted live by the media. In relation to many such cases, it has been recognized that economic rehabilitation and reconstruction — as also recalled today by Ambassador Jagne of Gambia, among others — constitute the major tasks facing Governments and civil society. Without significant international assistance of a kind the Security Council is not in a position, either legally or materially, to supply, it would be unrealistic to entertain the idea that stabilization and reconciliation are attainable.

In the light of its recent experience, the Security Council should consider a return to a simple and direct approach to its responsibilities. In our view, Council members should focus their attention on three broad areas: first, diplomacy, or what might be said to fall under "pacific settlement of disputes" in Chapter VI; secondly, the establishment of parameters for peacekeeping operations; and, thirdly, the question of enforcement. In the specific context of enforcement, we would like to underline the importance of preserving the indispensable degree of harmony between regional initiatives and our universal collective security regime, in line with the Charter. As regards post-conflict situations, there is a clear need for the development of approaches that will permit a gradual disengagement of the Security Council and a progressive engagement of other intergovernmental deliberative instances with appropriate legal and substantive competence.

To conclude, we believe that the Security Council cannot go wrong by favouring diplomacy as the preferred instrument for promoting peace; by refining the doctrinal tenets and operational aspects of peacekeeping; and by striving to observe the provisions of the Charter and other instruments of international law in all matters falling under its purview, and most of all with respect to Chapter VII or enforcement action.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Türk (Slovenia): The subject of today's open debate is well chosen and we wish to express our particular appreciation to you, Sir, for the choice. The Security Council is increasingly involved in issues of post-conflict peace-building and also of transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peace-building. In some cases, these situations also involve intense cooperation with regional organizations and a variety of non-governmental groups.

The link between post-conflict peace-building and the maintenance of international peace and security is obvious. International peace and security are not fully ensured without the establishment of conditions for the durability of peace after a military conflict. Precarious situations which are fraught with the dangers of a recurrence of war are not peace. Peace is more than an absence of an active military conflict. It requires the necessary minimum of political stability and security, which can be achieved through post-conflict peace-building activities. The success of such activities is by no means automatically ensured.

The Ambassador of Brazil spoke before me about the interplay between international and internal conflicts. Let me go a step further in this matter by referring to a particular conflict, which is an internal conflict, but one with international ramifications.

In recent days, the situation in Angola has been rapidly deteriorating into yet another phase of widespread military conflict. This is very unfortunate for several reasons. The most basic reason is, clearly, that the people of Angola will be deprived of the benefits of peace for yet another uncertain and possibly long period of time. Equally disconcerting, however, is the fact that the current deterioration has occurred after a period of progress towards peace and after some post-conflict peace-building activities had been started.

I wish to recall that, at the beginning of this year, on 9 January 1998, the Government of Angola and UNITA agreed on a 10-point final timetable for the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol. That timetable contained such steps as the demobilization of UNITA, the disarmament of the civilian population, the consolidation of the Government's administration throughout the entire territory of the country and other measures of transition towards post-conflict peace-building.

The objectives of that timetable were not fulfilled, mainly due to the subsequent change of mind and obstruction by UNITA. As a result, general deterioration took place and the situation degenerated into a new armed conflict which adds to the prevailing crisis in that part of Africa. This example shows how a failure in the transition from the stage of peacekeeping to the stage of post-conflict peace-building can seriously undermine peace and security in a larger region.

Therefore, the importance of efforts to succeed cannot be overestimated, and the United Nations must do its utmost to help in the process of post-conflict peace-building. The experience of past years has shown that such efforts are no less difficult than those to contain and stop the war. As a matter of fact, they are difficult in a different way, given the inherent complexity of demands in the process of transition from military conflict to durable peace.

While addressing this notion of complexity, I wish to say that the complexity of the tasks in question was duly recognized by the Secretary-General in his seminal report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" in 1992 (S/24111) and in the "Supplement to an Agenda for Peace" in 1995 (S/1995/1). A more recent and more specific set of proposals by the Secretary-General is contained in his report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318), published earlier this year and extensively discussed by the Security Council in recent months.

In the 1992 report, "An Agenda for Peace", the Secretary-General emphasized the importance of cooperative projects involving two or more countries in mutually beneficial undertakings intended to stabilize peace and ensure development. More generally, the Secretary-General emphasized:

> "When conflict breaks out, mutually reinforcing efforts at peacemaking and peacekeeping come into play. Once these have achieved their objectives, only sustained, cooperative work to deal with underlying economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems can place an achieved peace on a durable foundation." (*S/24111, para. 57*)

Slovenia has expressed its agreement with this general approach of the Secretary-General and has promised support. The question before the Governments of the United Nations Member States has been and will continue to be: what specifically can they contribute to the inherently cooperative nature of efforts for post-conflict peace-building? Which projects require practical contributions by Governments in the region concerned and beyond, and which require sustained political support? When such questions are asked, the issue of post-conflict peace-building becomes very specific, and therefore permit me to make a few specific observations on two areas of post-conflict peace-building.

One of the first priorities of any process towards post-conflict peace-building is mine action, which consists of demining, assistance to mine victims and the creation of mine awareness in the public at large.

The implementation of provisions of international instruments regarding demining and destruction of landmines must be the first priority. This is necessary not only to thwart the recurrence of a conflict, but also to minimize the land whose use is restricted by infestation and to expedite the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to both their zones and their livelihoods. Rehabilitation of mine victims is an important condition of normalization after a conflict and, perhaps most importantly, the way to restore both the productivity and the human dignity of those most severely affected. Mine awareness needs to be created and supported as part of the effort to mobilize the population for post-conflict activities. Peace cannot be sustained and development cannot thrive in an atmosphere where an explosion could wound any one at any time. Successful mine action, namely an action successful in all three main areas, strengthens both peace and development.

For all these reasons mine action must be considered as early as possible in the peace settlement process. Short-term priorities should therefore be carefully designed so as to reinforce the process of long-term mine action. It is important that mine action be integrated into the negotiation of peace agreements and that mine action take place as soon as possible. Ideally, humanitarian concerns on mine action should be part of the peacekeeping function itself. Close coordination between peacekeeping and humanitarian activities is needed so that mine action can start as an immediate priority of post-conflict peace-building.

At later stages, it may become necessary that the number of those involved in the mine action increases and that the cooperation projects of post-conflict peace-building called for in "An Agenda for Peace" are taken seriously. Slovenia is aware of these needs in all post-conflict situations, including, for example, those in Croatia and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and is actively involved in mine action, especially through its international trust fund for demining and mine victims assistance in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Demining, rehabilitation of mine victims and mine awareness become parts of a longer-term effort for stabilization of the situation after the conflict and for promotion of durable peace.

Another set of priorities relates to the need to stabilize peace through justice and protection of human rights. Often the credibility of justice demands that past violations be properly addressed. This may require that retributive justice be accepted as an essential ingredient of peace-building. Justice is a value in itself. Additionally, it is a basic condition for durability of peace.

The international community has gained important experience in pursuit of these tasks in the preceding years. The situations concerned range from those in Central America to South-East Asia and from Europe to the Great Lakes region in Africa. Earlier this year some of the main experiences in this regard were systematically analysed and presented in a book published by the Aspen Institute, entitled *Honoring Human Rights: From Peace to Justice*. That book showed that while the facts of each situation varied, in each there has been a need to give a proper meaning to peace through the efforts to strengthen human rights and to address the violations and war crimes of the recent past. The International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia are of vital importance for building real and durable peace. Various truth commissions established in recent years in some countries have also had beneficial effects.

A particularly important task relates to institution-building, which characterized several operations recently authorized by the Security Council. While most post-conflict missions start with monitoring the situation of human rights, monitoring is often not enough and has to be complemented by international support for institution-building. The projects of reforming or establishing national and local police forces should include human rights training and education, emphasize the relations between the police and the local community and focus on long-term sustainability of the police function. Judicial systems often require reforms intended to ensure their adequacy and their compatibility with generally accepted international standards. A particularly important task is to address the issue of impunity and to ensure that amnesty laws are in accordance with international law.

The experience of the United Nations and other international organizations over the past few years has confirmed the validity of the views expressed in "An Agenda for Peace" in 1992. Most importantly, perhaps, it has demonstrated that the complexity of the tasks requires a genuinely cooperative attitude of a variety of international agencies and organizations — global and regional, governmental and non-governmental — and the active involvement of United Nations Member States.

The experience of past years has also confirmed the need for all the relevant United Nations organs and agencies to take part in a cooperative manner. Several speakers before me referred to the role of the Economic and Social Council, and I agree with those opinions. I wish to add a point on the General Assembly, which, in my opinion, also has a role. The value of the Assembly's role in providing the broadest political framework for international efforts to consolidate peace and post-conflict peace-building has been reaffirmed in recent practice. The annual consideration by the General Assembly of the situations in Central America and in Bosnia and Herzegovina are cases in point.

The open debate in the Security Council today is part of a broader cooperative scheme of international efforts in situations of post-conflict peace-building. We hope that the views expressed in this debate will help in advancing the effectiveness of post-conflict peace-building and thus the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Slovenia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mrs. Odera (Kenya): My delegation, too, welcomes the decision to hold a debate on this important topic, in particular given its relevance to our continent, and we wish to thank you, Mr. President.

Primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the Security Council. International consensus on a proper Security Council response to situations of conflict is evolving. For a long time in the past the most obviously acceptable definition and the most practical measure in the hands of the Security Council in responding to a conflict situation was the deployment of peacekeepers within the limits of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter. That was in addition to preventive measures such as diplomatic efforts, negotiation, mediation, good offices and fact-finding missions.

At the end of the cold war it became immediately practical for the Security Council to agree on a more proactive definition that included other efforts not entirely falling within the confines of Chapter VI. Thus peace enforcement, which is now more and more in use under Chapter VII, has gained regard as a necessary and regular aspect of international consensus.

Today there is a growing realization that societies emerging from situations of conflict are themselves in conflict situations, and that specific measures are needed at the national and international levels to deal with those situations. Certain specific measures and programmes are required to be put in place to address the critical priorities involved. The objective is to encourage the delicate process of nurturing peace and, more important, to prevent a recurrence of the forces of conflict. There are many kinds of actions that need to be taken at the end of a conflict in order to consolidate peace and prevent the recurrence of armed confrontation. Such actions include efforts aimed at national reconciliation; the establishment of national unity; the safe, smooth and early repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons; the reintegration of ex-combatants and others into productive society; the establishment of well-managed regulatory institutions; and the establishment of a fair and reliable legal and judicial system and of a civilian police force.

Those programmes and measures are today popularly categorized under the subject of post-conflict peace-building activities. They may also include economic programmes. In his report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa", submitted to the Security Council in April 1998, the Secretary-General rightly pointed out:

> "Where a country's capacity to develop and implement a comprehensive economic programme has been disrupted by conflict, consideration must be given to relaxing the normally strict financial conditions imposed by international lending institutions." (*S/1998/318, para. 67*)

He goes on to say that some conditionalities may be antithetical to the peace process, and suggests that peace-friendly programmes be tailored to fit the particular situation.

The multidisciplinary nature of the post-conflict peace-building situation requires effective and politically sensitive coordination in order to put in place the requisite strategic framework to deal with this special situation. Lessons learned from recent United Nations experiences in post-conflict peace-building situations point to the need for the Secretary-General to set up a peace-building support structure to coordinate these activities. In such a situation, the ideal person to head such an office would be a political representative of the Secretary-General, preferably assisted by the United Nations Development Programme Resident Coordinator.

Such an arrangement must have the full support of the Security Council. It has been argued elsewhere that such support from the Council would be outside its mandate. It is the conviction of my delegation that, on the contrary, post-conflict peace-building activities are within the proper scope and mandate of the Council, precisely like diplomatic efforts, negotiations, mediation, good offices and fact-finding missions, because they have the same objective of preventing conflict. The Security Council should therefore rise to the occasion and support such efforts to the extent possible, in order to ensure the successful conclusion of its tasks in a given conflict situation.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Kenya for the kind words she addressed to me.

Mr. Konishi (Japan): I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting on the subject of post-conflict peace-building, the importance of which was stressed by the Secretary-General in his report (S/1998/318) on Africa.

There is a common recognition throughout the international community today that durable peace and sustainable development are two sides of the same coin. One cannot be achieved without the other. The achievement of those two goals will require a coherent and comprehensive approach.

Such an approach is particularly necessary in the context of post-conflict peace-building. Indeed, it is precisely in a situation where a conflict has been settled and the roles of political, humanitarian and development actors are intertwined, that the coordination of their respective efforts becomes crucial. Japan thus subscribes fully to the point made by the Secretary-General concerning the need for a strategic framework for their activities during this phase.

Let me address the three major categories of actors that need to be engaged during the phase of post-conflict peace-building one by one.

In the first category are those who play a political and security role in the country concerned. The Security Council certainly falls into this category, whether or not its activities are in the form of peacekeeping operations. Other notable actors in this category are regional organizations, like the Organization for African Unity (OAU).

The second category of actors playing an important role in post-conflict peace-building comprises of humanitarian agencies, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). In the third category are development agencies, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank.

The humanitarian and development agencies, in collaboration with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, have already done much to improve coordination among the actors in all three categories. For example, there is in place the practice of deploying representatives of development agencies at an early stage of peacekeeping activities. In addition, UNDP, in collaboration with OCHA, is working out a set of guidelines for efforts to be made by the Special Representatives and Special Envoys of the Secretary-General and by the Resident Coordinators. We believe that such coordination efforts must also be made by the Security Council within its own competence.

In the post-conflict phase there is a range of political and security tasks which require the support of the international community. First, there is the challenge of national reconciliation. In this respect, the international community, and particularly the Security Council, must monitor the implementation of the peace accord and call upon the parties concerned to make necessary efforts in that regard. Efforts to foster an environment in which free and fair elections can be held are also necessary. There may also be a need to establish an international criminal tribunal. These issues must be successfully addressed in order to lay the foundation for effective humanitarian and development assistance activities.

The Security Council may also be required to provide support for humanitarian agencies in times of political and social instability during the post-conflict peace-building phase. Such support might range from protecting humanitarian assistance operations to assistance for the repatriation of refugees and the resettlement of displaced persons.

The Security Council might also assist in the collection of weapons and in mine-clearing actions, thereby facilitating the return to normal daily life throughout the society.

I would like to suggest that, in order to strengthen the basis for coordination among various bodies and agencies on the ground, the Security Council take into consideration each of these roles as it formulates its response to any conflict, and particularly as it decides on the mandate of a peacekeeping operation.

As I mentioned earlier, the importance of efforts by the international community in post-conflict peace-building was stressed in the report of the Secretary-General on Africa. Among the several ongoing conflicts in Africa, I would like to touch on the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, since it is the conflict in that country which now poses the greatest threat to the security of the region as a whole.

At this stage, I believe the international community should make an effort to bring home to the parties participating in the negotiations for a ceasefire in the Democratic Republic of the Congo that a cessation of hostilities is just the beginning of a long peace process and that they should pay due consideration to the basic elements of post-conflict peace-building in negotiating the ceasefire agreement. It would be most desirable for the ceasefire agreement to include a political plan, such as a timetable, for achieving a peace accord, an affirmation of their commitment to ensuring free and unhindered access by international humanitarian agencies to the people in need and a demand that all parties refrain from laying additional landmines, and that the locations of the landmines that have already been laid be identified. If these elements are clearly stated in the ceasefire agreement and subsequently observed by all the parties concerned, the security environment and social stability will be strengthened, thus paving the way for more smooth post-conflict peace-building activities.

I wish to remind the Council that on 7 December the General Assembly, in its resolution on the report of the Secretary-General on Africa, stressed the importance of improved coordination among the various bodies and agencies of the United Nations system in assisting post-conflict peace-building, reconciliation, reconstruction and development in Africa. The Economic and Social Council decided that in the coming year it would follow up on the recommendations put forward in that report. There is a clear need for these three major bodies of the United Nations, including this Council, to pay due attention to each other's actions and coordinate among themselves. It is Japan's hope that the Security Council, for its part, will take the necessary steps — such as establishing a channel or a mechanism to ensure proper communication and exchange of views with other bodies and agencies in the United Nations system — so that it will be better prepared to respond to future post-conflict situations that may require action.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Japan for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Dahlgren (Sweden): My delegation, too, very much welcomes your initiative, Mr. President, for an open debate in the Security Council on the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. The title of the agenda item for this debate reflects some of the most important challenges facing the Council and the United Nations as a whole today.

We know that the absence of war is not the same as a lasting peace. We know that a ceasefire is seldom the end of conflict, but should hopefully be the beginning of peace. We know from all too many situations how difficult it is to sustain a peace which is kept but not truly built. And we know that finding durable solutions to complex conflicts requires cooperation across institutional boundaries between organizations and States.

A long-term and comprehensive perspective is necessary to resolve conflicts and to consolidate peace. This perspective is evident in the Secretary-General's report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa." It is clear that building lasting peace will require solutions that encompass development, democracy, human rights, conflict prevention and resolution, peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance. All these elements are necessary in order to prevent war and to ensure human security, and they are all directly relevant to the responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter.

The Secretary-General plays a crucial role in the peace-building efforts of the United Nations. We welcome the fact that he has attached such importance to the establishment of post-conflict peace-building structures as one way of helping countries recover from conflict. The United Nations Office in Liberia, for example, which I visited last week, is the latest example of such a peace-building presence, and we hope that the

Secretary-General will consider establishing a United Nations post-conflict presence in other situations as well.

Clearly, the Security Council has a responsibility to ensure that its efforts to prevent conflict and promote peace are followed by measures aimed at preventing the resurgence of conflict and the strengthening of peace, stability and reconciliation. When possible, these long-term aims should be taken into account at an early stage of the Council's deliberations on a particular crisis or conflict. The Council also has a responsibility to ensure that the transition to the post-conflict phase is as smooth as possible, whether or not that entails decisions to change a United Nations presence on the ground or to end an operation mandated by the Council.

The United Nations role in the peace process in Guatemala is a particularly clear example of post-conflict peace-building in action, an effort which involved the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as United Nations agencies. It is also an example of the value of integrating a peace-building perspective in peace agreements themselves.

The mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations must also include the elements needed to help secure a lasting peace. Multifunctional operations are playing an increasingly important role, as evidenced by the successful efforts of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic, and we fully agree with the Secretary-General that peace-building elements should be explicitly and clearly integrated into the mandates of peacekeeping operations. We encourage the Secretary-General to pursue this approach when making recommendations to the Council on new peacekeeping operations. We hope that when planning for a possible peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, such an integrated approach will also be considered. That is a conflict where there can be little doubt that a lasting solution will require comprehensive long-term efforts by the international community.

Even when post-conflict peace-building elements are not included in the original mandate of a peacekeeping operation, recommendations concerning the transitional period and the post-conflict phase should be included in the decision on the final drawdown of the operation, and multifunctional elements with the aim of ensuring sustainable peace and security can, of course, also be added during the conduct of an operation, for instance at the time of mandate extensions.

Post-conflict peace-building efforts may include demobilization, disarmament and reintegration into society of former combatants. Special attention is all too often called for to address the plight of child soldiers. Other important peace-building elements are the transformation of armed movements into civilian parties and support for the restructuring of police and armed forces. Experience also shows the importance of strengthening the judicial system, demining, reconciliation and confidence-building measures, as well as international support for elections.

We attach particular importance to efforts to deal with refugees and other displaced persons in the post-conflict phase. The concentration of such groups in temporary settlements has obvious implications for the stability of the host country or area, and the repatriation and return of refugees and displaced persons is not always a smooth process.

I began by speaking of challenges. One of the most difficult is perhaps that of ensuring coherence, coordination and dialogue between the bodies of the United Nations system and other actors involved in post-conflict efforts. We strongly welcome the continued development of the strategic framework within the United Nations. We firmly support the idea of the strategic framework as a tool enabling the United Nations to respond to crisis situations in a comprehensive, coherent and effective manner.

From the perspective of the Security Council, it is obviously important that there not be a vacuum in a transition between operations mandated by the Council and other peace-building efforts. For example, we could foresee cases where Council members and troop contributors would benefit from meeting with the Secretariat, United Nations agencies and the Bretton Woods institutions specifically to discuss a transition from one kind of United Nations presence to another.

We think that we have a responsibility not to close an operation unless we have a clear view of the road ahead, and unless we know that what has been invested to bring about peace will be followed up and will be maintained.

Today's open debate is proof in itself of the importance of post-conflict peace-building in the work of the Security Council. I hope that it will prove possible to follow up today's discussion, both in decisions relating to specific conflicts before the Council and as a thematic issue of key importance. My delegation, of course, would be prepared to work with other members of the Council on such a formal follow-up.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Sweden for the kind words he addressed to me.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): It is a great pleasure, Sir, to see you in the Chair this month. Thank you for convening this important meeting.

This discussion of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building is a valuable opportunity to improve the way we respond to our duty to promote human security, which the Secretary-General, in his report on Africa, called "the cardinal mission of the United Nations". (*S/1998/318, para. 2*)

A task of this magnitude goes well beyond the specific Charter responsibilities of the Security Council. The Council's role in conflict resolution can only be effective if it is part of a wider effort by the United Nations system. We lack, and must try to develop, more coordinated means of identifying and responding to crises so that the work of the Council is complemented by and integrated with the work of agencies including the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The Security Council now regularly receives briefings from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs at our informal consultations. This is a major step forward. The briefings of Mr. Vieira de Mello and his staff have proved the value of the coordinating role given to him by the Secretary-General. Mrs. Ogata's briefing during the presidency of the United States in November was a step which must be built on, for example by scheduling similar encounters with the heads of other agencies, funds and programmes. We should also devise means of cooperating with other interested organizations. For example, the lack of a consistent mechanism for consultation between the Council and the Organization of African Unity on matters affecting peace and security in Africa is an issue which needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.

If our efforts at peace-building are to be placed on firm foundations, we must take into account the role of the international financial institutions and such regional organizations as the European Union in post-conflict peace-building. The Presidency of the European Union will be making a statement later today with which the United Kingdom fully agrees. It is in Washington and Brussels that the major part of the world's financing for peace-building is found. The Security Council needs to devise ways to ensure that its political objectives complement the financial recovery packages which these bodies put in place.

The United Kingdom believes that coordination must start in the field if it is to be effective. The development of a strategic framework for United Nations action has the potential to produce improved results in the building of peace. We are following with interest its application in Afghanistan. Now is the time to consider testing the model in other situations. We should also seek to improve, where possible, the application of the concept. Afghanistan shows the need for all United Nations efforts in the field — political, humanitarian and developmental — to be placed under the authority of a single high-profile figure. That person should have the political weight to ensure that coordination is transformed from a theory into an effective, normal practice.

Peace-building does not start where peacekeeping stops. Peacekeeping will work best if it incorporates post-conflict peace-building. We must not, in constructing mandates for our operations, lose sight of the need to ensure that when a peacekeeping force withdraws the war does not resume. This means that operations need to ensure the development of local law and order capabilities, the restructuring of armed forces on a constitutional basis and the restoration of economic activity through properly planned infrastructure programmes. Civilian police components, demining programmes and the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants will often be essential elements of future multidimensional peacekeeping operations. Beyond this, peace-building means the strengthening of civil society, building local democratic institutions and ensuring that the rights of women, men and children are protected, in particular by ending the culture of impunity which all too often surrounds gross violations of human rights. We also need to ensure that conditions exist to resume the development process. Many of these activities will continue after the peacekeeping troops have left, and we need to think through mechanisms for assuring and financing the transition. Peace-building is a long-term process lasting many years after a peacekeeping operation withdraws. That means we must be ready to support it in the long term if peace is to be sustainable.

In fact, the wider aspects of peacekeeping operations are already being taken up by missions which no longer have a traditional peacekeeping element. The United Nations Verification Mission in Guatemala, the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti and the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia are three very different examples of this welcome evolution in the type of operations which can be undertaken by the United Nations. But we must look carefully at the budgetary arrangements. These operations must be financed in a stable and predictable manner. An appropriate provision should be made for them in the regular budget for each biennium.

The report this year by the Secretary-General on Africa (S/1998/318) gave us a useful stock of ideas on conflict prevention and peace-building. We have addressed in the Council those aspects of the report which fall within our exclusive purview. While the United Kingdom recognizes that a number of the Secretary-General's recommendations, especially those on post-conflict peace-building, range widely over the responsibilities of the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations system, we believe that the Council must not ignore their implications for its work. This opportunity to discuss post-conflict peace-building as an overarching issue is therefore welcome. But it is not enough. Peace-building will be of no value if it is treated solely as an academic subject. We must apply the lessons of this discussion and the wider wisdom of the Secretary-General's report in addressing current and potential conflict situations around the world. And we should continue to look for mechanisms, such as today's debate, which will allow us to pause, assess how we are doing and see whether we can do things better. All this will require an effort of imagination and an effort of will for all of us on the Council.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure you, Mr. President, my other colleagues on the Council and the Secretary-General of my delegation's full support in undertaking this shared task.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

I shall now make a statement as the representative of Bahrain.

As I am the last speaker before the Security Council this morning, let me express my gratification at hearing such valuable thoughts on the matter before the Council today: the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building, an item that demonstrates the need for several more meetings of this kind. Such meetings give Council members an opportunity to express their views on general topics of interest to the United Nations, outside the context of debating specific items on the Council's agenda. They also give non-members of the Council an opportunity to address the general topics of mutual concern.

Post-conflict peace-building and peacekeeping are among the important topics that the international community must address. The taking of effective post-conflict measures would further peace and prevent the recurrence of armed confrontation. Experience has shown that post-conflict peace consolidation calls for intensified efforts to address the root causes of conflicts.

Peace-building and peacekeeping call for building and consolidating national institutions, reforming and bolstering governmental organizations and strengthening those in charge of public order to protect the nation. It also calls for reintegration and rehabilitation programmes and for creating opportunities to resume the development process. Maintaining internal security, rebuilding confidence and invigorating socio-economic machinery in the country are critical for post-conflict peace-building.

For this to take place, the time factor is extremely important in peace-building. A multidisciplinary approach must be pursued to include all social and economic aspects simultaneously. To avoid the risk of a renewal of hostilities, there should not be a long interval after the end of the peacekeeping efforts. Moving speedily to post-conflict peace-building is critical.

The establishment of structures to support peace-building should be considered, and a study should be undertaken to evaluate the basic requirements of peace-building and how it should be carried out once the elements of peace-building have been clearly determined.

The priorities of post-conflict peace-building require solid foundations for development. To arrive at this objective, we must underline the need for reconciliation, the promotion of national unity, the repatriation of refugees and displaced persons and their safe resettlement in their homelands, the reintegration of former combatants into society and the mobilization of national and international resources in support of reconstruction and economic recovery. This calls for tremendous efforts on behalf of everyone.

Post-conflict peace-building is a multidimensional process. It calls for tremendous efforts and effective coordination on the part of the international community. The role of the United Nations in support of peace and in coordinating efforts is extremely important. The efforts of the United Nations in Liberia are a case in point.

The establishment of United Nations peacekeeping, peace-building or humanitarian missions requires the United Nations to guarantee the safety of United Nations personnel. The number of those who have died while in service has been on the rise; this is totally unacceptable.

The presence of the United Nations after the end of a conflict has a stabilizing and reassuring effect. It helps prevent a renewal of hostilities.

Development is considered a primary objective for all countries. Development is essential for reducing the number of conflicts. Sustainable development can enhance and accelerate the post-conflict peace-building process.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to stress the importance of the United Nations organs' implementation of their mandates as provided for by the Charter.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

There are a number of speakers remaining on my list. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, I intend to suspend the meeting now and to resume it at 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 11.40 a.m.

United Nations
S/PV.3954 (Resumption)

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

Provisional

3954th Meeting

Wednesday, 23 December 1998, 3.30 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Buallay	(Bahrain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Patriota
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Costa Rica	Mr. Sáenz Biolley
	France	Mr. Dejammet
	Gabon	Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi
	Gambia	Mr. Touray
	Japan	Mr. Konishi
	Kenya	Mr. Kihwaga
	Portugal	Mr. Soares
	Russian Federation	Mr. Fedotov
	Slovenia	Mr. Türk
	Sweden	Mr. Dahlgren
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Burleigh

Agenda

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was resumed on Wednesday, 23 December, at 4 p.m.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Duval (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): We congratulate you, Sir, on convening this meeting on the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. Too often, those two elements have been viewed as separate processes, while in fact they should be viewed as complementary parts of an integrated response to conflict. If we want to contribute to building lasting peace, the actions we take in this area will need to be better planned and coordinated.

In 1996 Canada launched a peace-building initiative in order to support local efforts to build lasting peace in areas of affected by conflicts. The objective is to support and supplement peacekeeping efforts through active diplomacy, by building coalitions with governmental and non-governmental partners, and by providing carefully targeted funding for innovative peace-building activities.

The implementation of this peace-building initiative has taught us that, to be truly effective, peace-building activities must address the security of individuals, including that of women and children. In the wake of conflicts, people need to be assured of their safety and well-being, particularly when civilians have been deliberately targeted. People need to be given a basis upon which to overcome apathy, to rebuild their lives and to regain hope for the future.

It goes without saying that not all the elements of post-conflict peace-building are the exclusive province of the Security Council. Nonetheless, the Security Council has a crucial role to play in ensuring that peacekeeping mandates anticipate, to the extent possible, the requirements of post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction. As appropriate, the Council mandates should incorporate provisions: to address the devastating impact of anti-personnel landmines on post-conflict reconstruction activities; for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants, including child soldiers; and to counteract the destabilizing effect of the proliferation of small arms.

The broader United Nations system must also be engaged in post-conflict peace-building activities if we hope to eliminate the deep-rooted — often historical and structural — causes of conflict. Without such an engagement, lasting peace will remain elusive. Further, other United Nations agencies and programmes, as well as the international financial institutions, the regional development organizations, bilateral aid programmes, international non-governmental organizations and the private sector have a role to play in rebuilding the economies and social structures of the affected countries and in supporting and nurturing a sustainable and lasting peace. Coordination is the crucial ingredient if we want all these efforts to be mutually reinforcing. And we also agree with the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, who said earlier in this debate that the Security Council must find ways to ensure that its political objectives and the financial recovery packages put in place by the international financial institutions complement one another. Otherwise we risk losing the gains that have been achieved, often at considerable human and financial cost, through what have come to be called classic peacekeeping operations.

Nonetheless, the countries emerging from conflicts retain the principal responsibility for providing for reconstruction and for reconciliation within their societies. If their citizens are not engaged in the effort, it is not a legitimate peace-building process.

The Special Representatives of the Secretary-General can play a pivotal role in building lasting peace by encouraging effective collaboration among the various stakeholders in a given country. We commend the practical and relevant recommendations developed by the forum on the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, organized in July 1998 by the programme for international cooperation and conflict resolution of the Norwegian Institute for Applied Social Science. We draw particular attention to the recommendations that emphasize the importance of broad cooperation among institutions in order to enhance both the moral authority and the effectiveness of the Special Representatives. On questions involving a single country and on trans-border security questions, Special Representatives can encourage cooperation among the organizations and donors so as to better address the needs of countries emerging from conflicts. The United Nations Peace-Building Support Office in Liberia, headed by the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Felix Downes-Thomas, is a model to be emulated. We also fully support the Kenyan proposal, made earlier in this debate, that peace-building support structures should be established so as to provide effective coordination.

Lasting peace must also address the fundamental human rights of conflict victims. The United Nations needs to support local efforts to overcome the culture of impunity which all too often characterizes conflicts and which for too long has blocked the observance of the rights of individuals. For this reason Canada has steadfastly supported the establishment of a permanent International Criminal Court. Until the Court begins work, the Council must continue to give its full support to the ad hoc tribunals.

Peace and the maintenance of peace are the Security Council's fundamental responsibilities. We believe that the Council can, and must, serve as the catalyst for the international community's efforts to deal with post-conflict issues and to build genuine and lasting peace. Success requires the engagement of local actors together with international support that is carefully planned, coordinated, multidisciplinary and adapted to the needs of the countries emerging from conflicts. The Security Council cannot achieve this on its own. Just as surely, success in post-conflict peace-building cannot be achieved in the absence of the timely, full and active engagement of the Council.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Norway. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): The agenda item under consideration by the Security Council at today's meeting relates to the complex character of one of the most fundamental purposes of the United Nations: to maintain international peace and security. Conflict resolution and peace-building involve mediation, peacekeeping, humanitarian efforts, demobilization and disarmament efforts, reconstruction and reconciliation, enhancement of human rights and good governance, and long-term economic and social development.

We appreciate this opportunity to participate in a debate within the framework of the Security Council on the challenges of post-conflict follow-up and the consolidation of peace. Experience has taught us that a ceasefire and the establishment of a peacekeeping operation are not sufficient to ensure peaceful development in a war-torn society. Too often we have seen the hopes for a better future shattered. Too often the vicious cycle of violence has proved to be stronger than aspirations for peace. It is important to plan for post-conflict peace-building from the outset, when armed conflict is still ongoing.

Norway therefore supports the efforts by the Security Council over the past few years to develop and adopt more comprehensive mandates for United Nations peacekeeping operations. Recent mandates have encompassed aspects that are critical for long-term peace-building, including the facilitation of the reintegration of refugees, the demobilization of combatants, the collection of weapons, the reintegration into society of child soldiers and the reinstatement of legitimate Governments.

Successful implementation of post-conflict peace-building efforts requires a clear commitment by the parties involved. Measures must be identified and designed in close cooperation with those directly concerned, taking into account the specific conditions and needs in each particular situation. It is therefore of vital importance to address the need for post-conflict peace-building measures in the very early stages of conflict-resolution efforts, and to include such measures in the negotiations on peace accords.

The implementation of such comprehensive activities also necessitates close coordination among the various departments and agencies of the United Nations. We commend the initiatives taken in this respect by the Secretary-General, both at Headquarters level in the context of United Nations reform — most notably through the efforts by the Administrative Committee on Coordination — and in the field through the enhancement of the role of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General. These efforts must be pursued and developed in the light of experience gained.

The large number of small arms available in conflict areas represents an important problem both during and after conflicts. There is a need to establish better control over transfers of small arms. There have been a number of encouraging regional initiatives in this regard, most notably the moratorium on the manufacture, export and import of light weapons declared by leaders of West African States on 30 October this year. Norway supports the call for a voluntary embargo on arms sales to conflict zones in Africa, as suggested by the United States. We welcome the proposal by the Secretary-General for increased transparency with regard to the supply of weapons to areas of actual or potential conflict, including measures to monitor and regulate the role of arms brokers.

The international community should support the implementation of such initiatives. In order to help the United Nations assist in national and regional initiatives effectively and without delay, Norway recently launched a trust fund for support to prevention and reduction of the proliferation of small arms. We encourage other countries to contribute to the fund.

Anti-personnel landmines also constitute a formidable obstacle to post-conflict reconstruction and the consolidation of peace. Norway is strongly committed to the follow-up to the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, including demining and rehabilitation activities, to which we have allocated $120 million over the period 1998-2002.

The report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (S/1998/318) clearly underlines the need for a holistic approach, where economic and social issues must be an integral part of international endeavours to secure and strengthen peace. This is true for Africa, but it is also true for other regions. Coherence must be ensured between the work of the Security Council and that of other bodies of the United Nations, in particular the General Assembly.

In many instances, it will also be important to improve coordination and information-sharing between the United Nations and regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The United Nations should play a leading role to ensure that all international efforts are carried out in a coordinated and efficient way. We must secure a better unity of purpose and integrate United Nations peace-building efforts with those of other stakeholders. Norway will assume the chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 1999, and we are determined to further refine the already well established working relationship between the United Nations and the OSCE.

Although each country has the main responsibility for ensuring a political climate that is conducive to stability and economic growth, the international community must provide broad support. Norway is strongly committed to doing its part. An important target of Norwegian development cooperation is to provide adequate funds and human resources to ensure that the critical post-conflict phase represents a bridge from despair to sustained peace and long-term development.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to convey to you our confidence that your rich diplomatic experience and wisdom will enable the Council to shoulder its responsibilities in the best possible way.

Under Article I of the Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security is one of the purposes of the United Nations, but it is also the essence of the role of the Organization and its main *raison d'être*.

The Charter contains well-defined measures to deter the aggressor in cases of aggression or the threat of aggression. But the course of events since the Charter was drafted, including differences in the nature of conflicts and the surrounding circumstances, has proved that it is almost impossible to implement the model designed by the Charter. Clear-cut cases where the Council easily identified the aggressor and the aggression and where it took the decision to use military force have been very few. It is in this context that peacekeeping operations were established, but experience has proved that peacekeeping operations do not completely satisfy the requirements of peace-building. The process of peace-building requires that the United Nations play an integrated, multi-faceted and more action-oriented role in order to create a climate conducive to political and economic stability in the State concerned.

While peacekeeping operations are aimed at creating an atmosphere of stability in the short term, it is imperative to conceive a series of long-term measures that would put an end to the chaos caused by a conflict, the continuance of which could generate new conflicts.

The importance of the concept of post-conflict peace-building to the work of the United Nations was underlined by the former Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, when he submitted to the General Assembly and to the Security Council the reports entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and subsequently "Supplement to An Agenda for Peace". That initiative which was meant to explain how to apply this concept with full respect for the existing balance between the principal organs of the United Nations. The ideas presented in "An

Agenda for Peace" were well received, and the General Assembly adopted its resolution 47/120 acknowledging the importance of the proposals on this concept and deciding to continue their substantive consideration.

The Assembly's thorough consideration of this important issue revealed that the concept needed further elucidation through the drafting of a working paper to reflect agreed details on the definition, principles, framework and scope of post-conflict peace-building activities as well as the role of the United Nations system in undertaking these activities. After lengthy discussion, agreement was reached on all aspects of a working paper, dated 17 January 1997. Regrettably, the opposition of one delegation prevented the adoption of the paper by the General Assembly. The opposition focused only on a paragraph stating that the General Assembly had the key role in post-conflict peace-building activities. All other delegations were then of the view that decisions on such activities must be entrusted primarily to the General Assembly, which could receive support from other principal organs of the United Nations, and from the specialized agencies.

Egypt believes that there is an integral relationship between the maintenance of international peace and security on the one hand, and post-conflict peace-building on the other. We also consider that post-conflict peace-building is one of the main responsibilities of the General Assembly. The Security Council or any other major organ of the United Nations system could play a supportive role to the primary role of the General Assembly in this field. The relationship that we see between the maintenance of international peace and security on the one hand, and post-conflict peace-building on the other, stems from the fact that measures for post-conflict peace-building can follow the successful end of a peacekeeping mission.

Therefore, it is beneficial to ensure smooth transition from peacekeeping operations, which are usually established by the Security Council — although the General Assembly also has that competence — to post-conflict peace-building activities under the supervision of the General Assembly.

I find it important at this juncture to refer to some of the imperatives for the success of any post-conflict peace-building activities. Post-conflict peace-building should be carried out in full respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, in particular the principles of sovereign equality, political independence, and non-intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. As a rule, it should be undertaken only at the request of and with the consent of the State concerned. It should be based upon the genuine will of the conflicting parties to cease and not to resume hostilities, and to commit themselves to national reconciliation, development and durable peace. It should be resorted to on a case by case basis, bearing in mind the requirements and needs of each State together with its cultural characteristics, as well as the right of each State freely to choose and develop its economic, political and cultural systems in full freedom. Post-conflict peace-building activities should have the support of the United Nations system as a whole in the context of defining these activities and of their implementation.

In this connection, we consider that the types of activities to be used after a conflict should be selected on a case by case basis, as I stated earlier. Meanwhile, I would like to highlight the importance of some activities which we find essential for the success of post-conflict peace-building, particularly in Africa — namely, the return of refugees, the resettling of internally displaced persons, reorientation and reintegration of former combatants into the ranks of productive civil society and, of course, demining. These are in addition to the activities that were highlighted by the Secretary-General in his report to the General Assembly and the Security Council entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318). These activities include assistance in rebuilding the economic and social infrastructure, assistance in reintegration into the world economy, direct economic and financial assistance and provision of humanitarian relief assistance.

In conclusion, I must emphasize the importance of the United Nations remaining the focal point for both facilitating and coordinating post-conflict peace-building activities, with the help and support of outside actors such as the World Bank and other financial institutions that could contribute to such activities. This will necessitate agreement among us, as Member States of the United Nations, on the basic rules of post-conflict peace-building operations. My delegation feels that the working paper of 17 January 1997, to which I referred a few moments ago, still provides a solid basis for this agreement, and we hope that it will be adopted by the General Assembly by consensus.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Austria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sucharipa (Austria): It is a special pleasure for me today to address the high representatives of this Council under your most able leadership, Mr. President, which we are confident will ensure a successful conclusion of the deliberations of the Council this month.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. In addition, the Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia — and the associated country Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area, Iceland and Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

In the past few years, peacekeeping operations have become increasingly multidimensional. United Nations peacekeeping today encompasses not only demanding military tasks, but also a variety of other functions which expand into the area of peace-building, such as civilian police activities, humanitarian assistance, demining, practical disarmament measures, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, enhancing and monitoring respect for human rights, support for democratic development, including election monitoring, and last but not least, public information. The European Union considers this a positive development which also proves the United Nations potential to meet new demands.

The multidimensional quality of today's peacekeeping operations poses new challenges to the United Nations, both at headquarters and in the field. Military and civilian personnel have to be specially trained, prepared and equipped for their ever more complex missions. Their tasks have to be coordinated with the respective activities of United Nations bodies and programmes.

At headquarters, this requires an integrated, coordinated approach with regard to actions which most often address combinations of political, legal, institutional, military, humanitarian, human rights-related, environmental, economic, social, cultural, and demographic factors of conflicts. In the field, this is greatly facilitated by special representatives and United Nations coordinators, who are given overall responsibility and authority with regard to the coordination of United Nations efforts and cooperation with national and international partners, as well as non-governmental organizations.

The European Union expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his valuable efforts in this respect, and in particular for the relevant proposals made and measures implemented in the context of United Nations reform. They have significantly enhanced the ability of the United Nations to respond to the complexities of post-cold-war conflict situations. With respect to peace-building in particular, we commend the Administrative Committee on Coordination for developing the new strategic framework concept, which provides a basis for more coherent strategies to link all aspects of external support for countries afflicted by conflict.

Furthermore, we would like to sincerely commend the Secretary-General for his valuable analysis pertaining to related matters, as contained in his landmark report, "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318).

The European Union welcomes the Security Council's continued efforts in responding to the challenges of combining peacekeeping and peace-building, in particular with regard to the new peacekeeping operations established this year in Africa, in the Central African Republic and in Sierra Leone.

In this connection, we would also like to welcome the Council's resolutions and presidential statements issued since the ministerial meeting in September 1997 on the situation in Africa, and in particular those documents which were adopted upon consideration of the assessments made by the Secretary-General in his report.

With regard to the recent General Assembly resolutions, let me recall the initiative "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures" by one of the European Union's Member States, which was co-sponsored by all 15 European Union countries. Integrating a wide variety of aspects from disarmament to peacekeeping matters, it is aimed at helping affected countries and regions that need assistance with regard to conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation.

International peace and security today must, obviously, signify much more than the absence of war between States. Peace, security, sustainable development, human rights and good governance are interdependent.

Modern day crises are, more often than not, intra-State rather than international conflicts, triggered by a range of factors, including social, ethnic or religious strife, the violation of human rights, poverty, inequitable distribution of resources, environmental degradation, large-scale migration, organized crime and terrorism.

To address and prevent violent conflicts caused by such crises, the United Nations has developed a comprehensive set of policy measures aimed at conflict prevention, management and resolution, including through peacekeeping and peace-building. With regard to the latter, the European Union recognizes that peace-building measures could apply in all phases of conflict and peace. However, as peace-building activities will generally embrace projects and programmes with the longer aim of the stabilization of societies, their impact will be greatest in non-violent situations, including post-conflict situations.

Since 1995, the European Union has adopted a number of important documents concerning peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution. Key amongst these are the June 1997 Common Position and Council conclusions on conflict prevention and resolution in Africa.

On 30 November this year, the Council of the European Union adopted conclusions, restating, *inter alia*, that the approach to peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution that has been developed within the Union, mainly in view of the African continent, should be extended to all developing regions. The Council of the European Union emphasized that full use should be made of the potential of development cooperation to contribute to peace, democracy and stability. It further welcomed, in particular, the respective assessments given by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report on Africa.

All this reflects the European Union's commitment to a proactive policy on conflict prevention and resolution, focusing on preventing the outbreak of violence at an early stage, as well as on peace-building, while using the full range of policy instruments available, including development assistance.

The Union underlines that the peoples concerned must take a lead role in peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution. We also stress that viable solutions can be achieved only through enhanced local ownership. Activities must, to the largest extent possible, build on local capacities and institutions.

Post-conflict reconstruction and peace-building aimed at the prevention of future conflicts are much more than repairing physical infrastructure. To address the root causes of violent conflicts in a targeted manner, it is imperative to consider the socio-political impact of assistance programmes and measures. For the European Union, support for democratization, the strengthening of legitimacy and of the effectiveness of government, respect for human rights, the rule of law and good governance play crucial roles in this regard.

We also strongly underline that external assistance, including peace-building measures, to societies in crisis or conflict should aim at promoting a fair balance of political, social, economic and cultural opportunity among different groups and at strengthening mechanisms for peaceful conciliation and the bridging of dividing lines. Furthermore, we should like to stress the importance, in this connection, of a vibrant civil society.

The Union fully shares the view of the Secretary-General, expressed in his report on Africa, that protecting human rights, and in particular political rights and economic freedoms; promoting transparency and accountability in public administration; and fighting corruption are not merely crucial, but prerequisites for building peace and promoting development.

Guided by the principles which I have just mentioned, the European Union has made considerable and continuous contributions to peace-building efforts through various programmes in our own continent, in particular with respect to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Latin America and elsewhere. For its effectiveness, action by the Union also relies on active cooperation with the United Nations; other international organizations; regional organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE); and subregional organizations. In this connection, we would also like to draw the Council's attention to the concept of mutually reinforcing institutions, contained in a document recently adopted by the Council of the European Union, which emphasizes the necessity of ensuring that the involvement of more than one organization and its member States results in complementary and mutually supportive contributions.

Let me conclude with a few practical thoughts on peacekeeping and peace-building and their possible interdependence. Many of today's peacekeeping operations provide an indispensable basis for wider peace-building efforts. Their presence is in fact a precondition for the successful start or continuation of peace-building programmes, which usually makes it logical and necessary to integrate strong peace-building elements into peacekeeping operations. On the other hand, effective peace-building efforts can provide the conditions for peacekeeping missions to wind down or be completed once peace has become sustainable. Ideally, they would help to limit the duration and size of peacekeeping operations and other external interventions. For all these reasons, the European Union strongly supports United Nations endeavours to combine peacekeeping and peace-building measures in a balanced and complementary manner.

We would like to stress in this regard that there is no comprehensive peace-building design and that it might not even be useful trying to define it. Peace-building measures have to be chosen and tailored according to the specific situations and different causes of conflict. This holds particularly true when they are part of or interlinked with peacekeeping operations. Identifying them will best be done in the peace accords between the parties to conflicts.

We fully subscribe to the Secretary-General's view, again expressed in his report on Africa, that peace-building does not replace ongoing humanitarian and development activities in countries emerging from crisis, but rather aims at building on, adding to or reorienting such activities in ways designed to reduce the risk of a resumption of conflict and contribute to creating conditions conducive to reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery.

Peace-building measures have to be designed and implemented accordingly. They will also require long-term commitments, pragmatism, flexibility, creativity and the will to provide all necessary resources. But the efforts to make and the price to pay for peace will always seem small when compared to the human, social and economic losses incurred in protracted or resumed violent conflicts.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Austria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): It is ironic for us to be addressing the role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security at a time when the ability of this Council to play it has been dealt a devastating blow as a result of a unilateral action undertaken without due debate and authorization from the Council. Perhaps this underlines how deep is the need for the reform of the working methods of the Security Council and of its members in order to bring them into line with the aspirations and expectations of the general membership of the United Nations, as incarnated in the General Assembly.

The very first Article of the Charter outlines one of the purposes of the establishment of the United Nations as the maintenance of international peace and security. While the General Assembly was empowered to consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security and to discuss any questions brought before it by any Member State or by the Security Council, the primary responsibility in this regard was conferred on the Security Council itself. This arrangement was devised with a view to ensuring prompt and effective action by the United Nations.

Since the establishment of the United Nations, the General Assembly and the Security Council have attempted to work more or less in tandem in addressing this subject. Meanwhile, the broader parameters of peace and security have expanded in recent years. As the Secretary-General has mentioned in his annual report to the General Assembly, there exist

> "many other threats to human security, such as natural disasters, ethnic tension and human rights violations" (*A/53/1, para. 27*)

which may also be sources of conflict. The United Nations therefore needs to adopt an integrated approach in addressing the issues concerning the maintenance of international peace and security.

In the post-cold-war period, the dimensions of United Nations activities have changed significantly. A range of new concepts has emerged in the process of dealing with the new challenges, including preventive diplomacy, peace-building and peace enforcement. Some of these concepts were thoroughly discussed by the Member States in the Working Group on an Agenda for Peace and its four sub-groups with a view to reaching common understandings. While the two sub-groups on coordination and on United Nations sanctions have concluded their work, the sub-groups on preventive diplomacy and peacekeeping and on post-conflict peace-building could not conclude their deliberations for lack of consensus. In the case of post-conflict peace-building, only one country opposed the adoption of the recommendations of the sub-group, and this led to a deadlock. Hopefully, the recommendations of that sub-group can move forward now.

In the immediate post-cold war period, there was a surge in the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations. In 1994, the total number of United Nations troops and observers deployed went up to about 73,000 in 17 peacekeeping missions, but this was followed by a period of relative decline. At present, there are only about 14,000 troops and observers deployed in 17 peacekeeping missions, including the two new missions set up over the past year in the Central African Republic and in Sierra Leone. The decline in United Nations involvement cannot be taken to indicate that the number of conflicts or disputes has decreased. In fact, the decline is to be attributed only to the reluctance to engage in new operations for various reasons, including financial constraints. In some cases, this responsibility has been conveniently shifted or sub-contracted to regional organizations. We agree with the Secretary-General that United Nations peacekeeping offers unique advantages not to be found elsewhere, including the universality of its mandate and the breadth of its experience. The United Nations must therefore continue to play its primary role in maintaining international peace and security. The role of the regional organizations must be strictly governed by Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

The pitfalls of the United Nations undertaking half-hearted peacekeeping operations are enormous, and stand as a sad commentary on the actual capacity of the United Nations to deliver. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute, one of the very oldest on the agenda of the Security Council, is a case in point. The failure of the international community to fulfil its commitment to the people of Jammu and Kashmir has brought India and Pakistan to conflict several times in recent decades. Unfortunately, no determined and sustained efforts have been made by the United Nations to resolve the root causes of the conflict.

In view of the heightening tensions in the region in recent months, we have requested the Secretary-General to further strengthen the United Nations presence along the line of control for effectively monitoring cross-border violations along the disputed territory of Kashmir. A request has also been made to the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to coordinate the efforts of the United Nations in this volatile region. No follow-up has been recorded so far.

This is particularly important because of the need to defuse the new and heightened tensions that arose in South Asia after the nuclear tests conducted by India, and then by Pakistan, early this year. The Security Council, in its wisdom, adopted resolution 1172 (1998) on 6 June 1998 in an attempt to enforce non-proliferation, contrary to the letter and the spirit of various international instruments and treaties, rather than ensuring the implementation of its own resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir, a dispute of which the Security Council remains seized, and which is the root cause of the tension between India and Pakistan. We believe that the prime responsibility of the Security Council should continue to be peace and security and ensuring respect for its own resolutions.

The conflict in Afghanistan is another example of the failure of the United Nations to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter. The international community lost all interest in Afghanistan soon after the withdrawal of the occupying Soviet forces from that country. Afghanistan was allowed to be plunged into civil strife, resulting in the further destruction of the war-stricken country. Consequently, over 1.5 million Afghan refugees still reside in Pakistan. Because of donor fatigue, we are providing succour to them almost single-handedly. The international community must accept the blame for its inaction and should remedy the situation by playing its due role in bringing peace to the Afghan people and by contributing towards the reconstruction of that devastated country.

The conflicts in Africa constitute almost 60 per cent of the issues currently under consideration by the Security Council. The best way to prepare for the emergencies in that continent would be to develop an efficient early warning system and to build appropriate capabilities to effectively respond to simmering crises in Africa, as in other parts of the world.

The key to a better management of peace and security lies in a shared responsibility between the General Assembly and the Security Council, balancing what we expect of the latter, with its smaller membership, with what we expect of the former, with its undoubted democratic weight. On too many occasions the Security Council has been unwilling or unable to fulfil its responsibilities, either because of blockages created by the veto or the unilateral actions of one or another of its permanent members, or because it has lacked the collective courage and verve to implement its own resolutions.

For its part, Pakistan remains committed to the purposes and principles of the Charter and will continue to contribute in every possible way to achieving our goals of collective security and peace and prosperity.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Tunisia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hachani (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, my delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, on the way in which you have been carrying out your work as President of the Security Council, and we wish you complete success in the discharge of your important functions.

We congratulate the Security Council on its decision to hold this important formal meeting, with a debate open to all Members of the Organization on the subject of "Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building".

The wording of the agenda item makes clear one fundamental fact that is becoming increasingly evident: the close link between peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building through various actions aimed at making peace sustainable.

Throughout its existence, the United Nations has built up valuable experience in peacekeeping, having managed to prevent numerous conflicts and restore and maintain peace in various places throughout the world, in particular by coming between belligerents so as to facilitate the conclusion and implementation of peace agreements. The Organization certainly has to its credit numerous successes of which it can be proud today. That extensive United Nations experience in peacekeeping, especially during the past decade, nonetheless teaches us, among other things, how vital it is after conflicts to ensure that all the conditions are met so that peace can continue.

Hence the need to do everything possible to strengthen confidence among the former parties to a conflict, to create a new climate favourable to national reconciliation and to encourage the resumption of economic and social activities that improve the daily lives of the population by addressing the underlying causes of conflict. Therein lies the importance of post-conflict peace-building.

On the new international post-cold-war chessboard, post-conflict peace-building is so important to the maintenance of peace that it is an essential counterpart and even a corollary to it. Peace-building has many facets. These include crucial and complementary measures which together contribute to the restoration of confidence, to the re-establishment of normal life and to the rebirth of hope among people; in a word, they contribute to a return to normalcy in the country or countries ravaged by war, depending on whether the conflict was internal or between two State entities. Among these facets, it is important to mention disarmament, demining, electoral assistance, the repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons and economic reconstruction.

These are the most important peace-building measures, to whose implementation the international community must actively and substantively contribute, in particular through the Security Council, the General Assembly and other bodies and agencies of the United Nations, each in its own area of competence.

My delegation emphasizes the need to give post-conflict peace-building programmes and their implementation the greatest chance for success for the benefit of peace. For that, we believe that certain parameters should guide the international community's action in this area.

We are thinking first of the urgency of the effective implementation of peace-building programmes. For even if in principle the concept of peace-building implies that it will take place following the end of hostilities and upon the achievement of a political settlement, the boundary is not so clear-cut between a given United Nations peacekeeping operation and post-conflict peace-building activities. Thus, even before the end of a conflict, the needs of the countries concerned should be identified and the means for meeting them should be known. Some peace-building activities, such as demining or disarmament and electoral assistance, benefit from being carried out before the end of the actual United Nations peacekeeping operation, if there is one. It is also preferable to begin operations to repatriate refugees and displaced persons as soon as possible, as humanitarian problems have a direct impact on all national reconciliation efforts. Economic recovery activities should also be undertaken without delay.

Secondly, my delegation considers that it is necessary for all post-conflict peace-building efforts to be coordinated with the various actors involved. All peace-building programmes must reflect an overall integrated and coherent strategy which takes into account the needs and specific characteristics of the countries in question. In addition to humanitarian programmes, we are thinking here of activities such as those related to economic and social reconstruction which require a contribution by donor countries and by the United Nations and its various organs and specialized agencies.

Thirdly, the international community should give particular attention to the financing of economic recovery as part of post-conflict peace-building. Two remarks are appropriate here relating on the one hand, to the need for rapid availability of these resources, and on the other hand, to the necessary consideration of the degree of fragility of peace in the country or countries concerned. This requires flexible financial conditions which are as concessional as possible, as suggested by the Secretary-General in his report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa.

Finally, we would like to repeat the importance to all peace-building activity of the principles of the consent of the parties involved to receiving assistance from the international community, of respect for national sovereignty of the countries concerned, and of non-interference in their internal affairs.

Tunisia has participated in United Nations peacekeeping activities since the beginning of the 1960s through its contributions to various United Nations peacekeeping operations. Today, my country is participating in three of these operations by providing civilian police contingents. This civilian police sector is a new post-conflict peace-building activity which is being used increasingly by the United Nations.

Tunisia is determined to continue to support this United Nations work and is following with interest the Security Council's deliberations on this matter, deliberations which, in our view, should lead to a clearer concept of post-conflict peace-building, to improvement in its practice and to greater clarification of its link to peacekeeping.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Tunisia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Petrella (Argentina)(*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on the effective manner in which you have been presiding over the work of the Security Council during the month of December. I also wish to congratulate you on the initiative to convene an open debate on this important issue. In view of your experience and cool-headedness, we are convinced that these complex issues will be dealt with in an appropriate manner. Allow me to extend my congratulations also to your predecessor, Ambassador A. Peter Burleigh of the United States. His keen professionalism and positive attitude towards all members and non-members of the Council are truly appreciated.

The matter before the Council is particularly relevant to Argentina, given its interest in peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building matters. In this connection, experience appears to indicate that peace-building activities raise at least two questions. The first is whether peace-building activities have a basis in the Charter, and the second is when is the best time to begin them?

With regard to the very concept of peace-building activities, it is clear to us today that the concept of international peace and security rests on more qualitative and complex aspects than those which emerge from the traditional interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. This is logical because since the end of the cold war, a strict interpretation of concepts established in 1945 no longer meets today's needs.

With regard to the second question — when is the best time to begin peace-building activities — it seems to us a formalist view which favours the legal end of the conflict can actually undermine the inherent objective of these peace-building activities. In fact, experience also suggests, depending on the characteristics of each conflict, the usefulness of anticipating peace-building activities even before the conflict is formally ended. Obviously, this assumes the minimal conditions for multidimensional action.

Argentina has traditionally maintained that the humanitarian, institutional, economic and ethnic consequences of conflicts show that much more than a ceasefire is needed to initiate a lasting peace. At this moment in history, when problems are essentially problems within States, this is even more apparent.

The issues involved in Central America's reconstruction demonstrated the far-reaching importance of peace-building activities when such activities are taken on, in a show of considerable maturity by the protagonists of the conflict as their own objectives.

In the case of the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), the United Nations Secretariat played an innovative and central role in the negotiation of agreements and the monitoring of peace-building. The experience of the Representative of the Secretary-General in this operation recalls the importance of cooperation between the Security Council and financial institutions in order to promote development.

In the case of Haiti, which is currently on the Council's agenda, it seems clearly advisable at this time to explore mechanisms for reconstruction, particularly in view of the fact that the political situation in that country is becoming increasingly stable. Just as in the case of ONUSAL, reconciliation, democracy, good governance and development represent the road to success. Also as in the case of ONUSAL, in Haiti the work of the representatives of the Secretary-General has been, and continues to be, extremely useful.

We have mentioned these two cases because, in our view, they represent positive experiences for other undertakings. Moreover, these situations serve as examples of the fact that in some regions, such as the Americas, the concept of peace and security draws inspiration from the qualitative elements we mentioned at the beginning of our statement.

In conclusion, allow me to stress some ideas that we believe might be useful in this respect.

First, as we said at the outset, we find ourselves at a time when the concept of peace and security is based on broader criteria than in 1945. This important characteristic can be seen clearly in the examples of Latin America and the Caribbean, to which I have referred briefly.

Secondly, peace-building activities do not necessarily start with the signing of a peace agreement; they may begin at a later stage of a multidimensional operation once the minimum conditions for action have been met.

Thirdly, we should avoid any approach that tends to involve exclusionary criteria. Coordinated efforts on the part of the international community and of the various agencies of the United Nations system are needed. Likewise, in order for peace-building activities to lead to durable peace and reconciliation, we must also create the necessary conditions for sustainable development in the context of democracy.

Finally, no operation of this kind can be successful if it lacks the necessary funds or personnel. When donor fatigue prevails, such issues require special attention. How and from where should resources be obtained? That question will have to be answered in future if we want to keep in check problems that could ultimately also result in considerable costs.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Argentina for the kind words he addressed to me and to my predecessor.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Republic of Korea. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Lee See-Young (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation to you for your initiative to organize the Security Council's open meeting today on the important issue before us. We also welcome today's meeting as yet another meaningful step forward in restoring the transparency of the work of the Security Council.

In many conflict situations these days, it has become increasingly hard to define a clear boundary between peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building operations. More often than not, maintaining peace is as difficult as restoring peace. It is therefore imperative for the international community to take a holistic approach to ensure not only the restoration of peace but also its consolidation in conflict areas.

When the Security Council considers authorizing peacekeeping operations which would involve post-conflict peace-building activities, the Council, in our view, should provide clear, realistic and appropriate mandates for such activities, backed by sufficient resources. It is equally important to respect the distinct mandates of other United Nations organs, bodies or agencies which cover post-conflict peace-building measures.

Having said that, I would like to comment on the following four points to which my Government attaches particular importance.

My first point concerns the need for more effective coordination among all actors as well as local capacity-building. The multifaceted nature of post-conflict peace-building inevitably brings together a number of different bodies and actors. First and foremost, it is important to maintain close coordination between the two major organs of the United Nations, namely the General Assembly and the Security Council, which have the main political responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter.

My delegation supports the coordinating role of the Department of Political Affairs as the focal point at Headquarters and that of special or other representatives of Secretary-General in the field, as set out in the Secretary-General's report of 18 November 1998.

In this connection, we look forward to further elaboration of the Secretary-General's suggestion in favour of the strategic framework approach for response to and recovery from crisis. My delegation hopes that such a strategic framework would be formulated as soon as possible, drawing on the various lessons learned from past experiences. In this process, special attention should be paid to the need to ensure the smooth transition from the peacekeeping phase to peace-building activities.

We are of the view that one of the main focuses should be on exploring the practical ways and means to cultivate the local capacity to sustain peace in the fragile conditions of the post-conflict period. It is not only more effective but also more economical to help local communities to build their own capacities to sustain peace in the long run. In this connection, the involvement of regional or subregional organizations in the process would be very useful, given their geographical proximity and comparative advantage in terms of local information. Moreover, in view of the financial burdens of various peace-building activities, it is also necessary to explore the possibility of engaging international financial institutions in this process at an early date.

Secondly, we believe that measures towards disarmament and demobilization, including the collection and dismantling of small arms and the rehabilitation of militias, are keys to avoiding the recurrence of violence and to building peace in post-conflict situations. With this in mind, my Government contributed $250,000 last year, when we served on the Council, to the programmes for the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants in Angola.

We welcome the ongoing efforts of the Council to enhance the effective implementation of the arms embargoes already imposed by the Council. With cross-border arms flows well in place, however, country-specific arms embargoes do not suffice to stem the illicit trafficking of arms. In this regard, we look forward to the Secretary-General's playing a positive role in implementing the Security Council recommendations on the regional approach to the illicit flow of arms to and in Africa, as contained in Council resolution 1209 (1998) of 19 November this year. We believe that the establishment of appropriate regional and subregional registers of conventional arms should not be limited to Africa but should be expanded to other continents as well. More efforts should also be made to deal with the supply side of the arms flow.

Thirdly, I wish to stress the importance of demining as one of the essential components of post-conflict peace-building. Given the sheer number of landmines strewn over the globe and the formidable costs of their clearance, the impact of anti-personnel landmines extends beyond the immediate danger to lives and property to a wide array of socio-economic and developmental aspects in the mine-affected countries.

Mine clearance is now a global agenda requiring global action. We therefore welcome the establishment of the United Nations Mine Action Service as the focal point for mine action within the United Nations system. We hope that the Service will strengthen its cooperation with various regional and subregional organizations.

Since 1996, my country has actively participated in the Mine Action Support Group as a donor and made contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund to help with mine clearance in Cambodia, Tajikistan and Ethiopia.

Last but not least, we would like to invite the Council, once again, to give special attention to the need for ensuring the security and safety of United Nations and other personnel, as well as the security and safety of all innocent civilians in conflict situations. We believe that the Council should continue to give high priority to this issue.

In this connection, my delegation welcomes the specific recommendation contained in Council resolution 1208 (1998) to include, in the United Nations Stand-by Arrangements, military and police units and personnel trained for humanitarian operations, together with related equipment. We support this recommendation's early translation into action. We wish to request Council members to continue to look at other options to enhance the security and safety of all those in need of protection as well as of their protectors.

Post-conflict peace-building is indeed a very challenging task for the international community today, as the number of conflict situations grows in the post-cold-war era. In particular, it takes even greater time and energy to build peace and socio-economic infrastructure in cases where States fail or societies collapse. The international community should avoid wasting the valuable resources it has spent to restore peace by leaving that peace vulnerable to renewed conflicts.

We welcome today's open meeting as an opportunity to increase international awareness of this important issue. We sincerely hope that the views and suggestions presented here today will help Council members and the United Nations system as a whole to better address this important and urgent issue and to take relevant actions as necessary sooner rather than later.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia): I am honoured to have the opportunity to address the Council on this agenda item. At the outset, I would like to express our gratitude to you, Mr. President, for initiating and organizing the consideration of this important issue.

We believe that thematic consideration of wider issues pertaining to strengthening international peace and security is quite useful, especially when there is wider participation and input, as at this meeting. In this regard, we believe that the several meetings devoted to Africa and its problems — including the meetings on the causes of conflict in Africa, on the question of children and armed conflict, and others — have proved to be useful, not only in drawing the attention of the international community to these pressing issues, but also in determining adequate responses to them. Therefore, we believe that today's consideration will prove useful as well.

Taking a broader approach to security implies addressing wider dimensions of international security. Being the organ of the United Nations with the principal responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, the Security Council is expected to address these questions. Post-cold-war practice has vividly demonstrated that there is a direct link between the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. As far back as 1992 this link was underlined in the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" and its supplement. Since then life has shown that peace-building, peacemaking and peacekeeping operations can be truly lasting if and when the question of post-conflict peace-building is correctly and successfully tackled. We fully agree that, though post-conflict peace-building may not be considered part of peacekeeping and peacemaking, the essential elements of post-conflict peace-building should be borne in mind and, to the extent possible, reflected in peace agreements and settlements. On the other hand, when post-conflict peace-building is successful, it, in its own turn, broadens and strengthens the foundations of peace and security.

Almost seven years have passed since the summit meeting of the Security Council addressed broader issues of international peace and security. The post-cold-war experience — be it in many countries of the Africa continent, in Cambodia or in Central America — demonstrates that disarming the previously warring parties, the destruction of weapons, demining, restoration of order, repatriation of refugees, organizing and monitoring elections, strengthening governmental institutions and, in many cases, promoting the fuller political participation of former adversaries are all important factors in post-conflict peace-building. The example of Mozambique and some other positive examples have been cited here. Other examples — or should I say, lessons — caution that ignoring post-conflict peace-building makes peace very fragile.

With the increasing interdependence of States and increasing globalization, non-traditional — or should I say, non-military — sources of threats to peace and security are also increasing. This demands that the socio-economic root causes of many conflicts also be properly addressed. Otherwise, no peace can be stable or durable. Today's consideration of this item bears testimony to the realization and acceptance of this reality.

It is also of great importance to address properly the question of national reconciliation and the psychological and political factors that define the attitudes of States in conflict towards each other, or of parties in case of internal conflicts. In our view, mutual suspicion needs to be overcome and social peace allowed to take root and develop if the recurrence of conflict is to be avoided.

Furthermore, the root causes — that is, the underlying political, economic, social and ethnic problems that have led to the conflict in the first place — ought to be seriously addressed and dealt with.

Otherwise, previously taken measures, however important and successful they might have been, would only be half measures. In this, we believe, the role not only of the Security Council, but of all the relevant United Nations bodies, especially the General Assembly, as well as the Economic and Social Council, development agencies, financial institutions, regional organizations and the donor community is essential.

In that regard, the reform of the United Nations system should also address the questions of the roles of the appropriate United Nations bodies in more effectively addressing the questions of development. We believe that the emerging new concept of human security provides the opportunity to address this question in a more comprehensive manner. As today's debate underlines, the questions of proper coordination of the post-conflict peace-building efforts of the international community, of avoiding duplication and of financing these actions need to be addressed. With respect to the latter, effective mobilization of internal and international resources is of crucial importance. Equally, short-term peace-building measures need to be followed up by long-term programmes and strategies aimed at strengthening national institutions, promoting good governance, eradicating poverty and ensuring sustainable development.

In conclusion, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the Security Council has been dealing mostly with immediate problems and has not so often considered questions of ensuring peace and security in the broader context. We believe that addressing other, broader issues of the maintenance of international peace and security, such as the one that is being considered today, would not only promote further transparency and wider participation by States that are not members of the Council, but would also prove quite useful.

The President *(interpretation from Arabic):* I thank the representative of Mongolia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Croatia. I invite her to take a seat at the Council table and to make her statement.

Ms. Grčić Polić (Croatia): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this exchange of views. We sincerely hope that today's deliberations will help us better understand, and therefore refine, the existing methods or conceptualize new methods of maintaining or restoring international peace and security. The current situation in Iraq represents another poignant reminder that thorough discussions on how to maintain peace and security are needed. There are just too many open, even controversial, questions concerning the role of the United Nations and the Security Council in relation to the role of regional organizations, which have to be resolved.

It is a well-known fact that the world is becoming ever more interdependent. A crisis in today's day and age — be it financial, humanitarian or other — embodies a potential to affect entire regions, and beyond. The most recent examples include the Asian financial crisis, where the collapse of markets in Indonesia and Korea was felt from Japan and Australia to Europe and the United States, and the Rwandan conflict, which, though its intensity waned many years ago, has now affected much of Central Africa.

Experience teaches us that any crisis can be better handled in its early stages. In this regard, one might ask whether optimal use of potentials following the fall of the so-called Iron Curtain and the democratization of Central and Eastern Europe has been achieved. Could we have moved more quickly to help countries in transition push through reforms? And what kind of assistance could have been earmarked to do so? Could the early identification of, and reaction to, problems faced by countries in transition have a positive effect on their later development, and what would ignoring the signs mean in the long run?

In essence, when does a conflict end? Is it with the cessation of active hostilities, or with the resolution of its underlying causes? Croatia believes that identifying and addressing the root causes of a problem which can have regional or global repercussions is the most important factor in securing international peace and security. Just patching up a situation and not resolving fundamental antagonisms in a society can have the effect of leaving a wound to fester. This is equally important before, as it is after, a conflict or crisis has arisen: before, because it can help avoid a conflict, and after, because it can help cure open wounds.

Let me remind the Council of a negative example. Seven years after the dissolution of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the aggression against Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the succession issue of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is yet to be resolved and the new Federal Republic of Yugoslavia still refuses to accept existing borders and the equality of all successor States.

The next phase — post-conflict peace-building — is just as important as bringing a conflict or crisis to an end. A post-conflict society is usually weak. Its infrastructure is destroyed or damaged, its people are needy, resources are scarce, human rights are not efficiently protected and painful memories are still fresh. In addressing these issues, Croatia supports the views presented by Secretary-General in his report (A/51/950) entitled "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform". In that report the Secretary-General obliquely stated that successful peace-building requires a mutually reinforcing political strategy and assistance programme, incorporating human rights considerations and humanitarian and development programmes. The importance of mutual reaffirmation of these two approaches to peace-building cannot be overemphasized.

Building peace, as in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, has required not only the rebuilding and strengthening of civilian government and civil institutions and infrastructure, but also stimulating investment and restarting the economy through financial donors. The complete recovery and creation of a self-sustaining society, however, will occur only when root causes have been adequately addressed and resolved. Although it should be reiterated that the parties themselves must bear the primary responsibility in sustaining the achievements of the international community, continued support, especially from countries in the region concerned, will be an important element in assisting States such as Bosnia and Herzegovina to fulfil their obligations.

The post-war reconstruction and reconciliation processes which are taking place in Croatia are processes, or phenomena, that necessarily take time, but that can be accelerated through international support. Conditions for the return of displaced persons and refugees have been established, even though the economic and social situation in war-affected areas remains difficult. There is a significant shortage of capital for new investment, job creation and specific projects, such as demining. Therefore, the political, human and financial resources of the international community already invested in Croatia should be coupled with development assistance if the desired results are to be achieved. Investment in peace, followed by investment in development, is part of the same continuum. Accordingly, we hope that the conference on development held in Zagreb this month will have a successful follow-up.

The establishment of truth about a conflict and the punishment of perpetrators of grave conflict-related breaches of humanitarian law is another prerequisite for the re-establishment of peace and security. On the global level, the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) should serve to aid and expedite the healing and reconciliation process. However, one must take heed of a serious warning: if we intend to develop the ICC into a credible institution, we must avoid the traps and shortfalls discovered in the practice of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The Security Council cannot afford to allow the lack of cooperation of any State or entity — in this case the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republika Srpska entity of Bosnia and Herzegovina — to distort the true picture of the conflict and thereby betray the fundamental objectives for which the Tribunal was founded. The process of reconciliation hinges upon bringing people like Sljivancanin, Mrksic, Radic, Martic, Karazdic and Mladic to justice.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Akunwafor (Nigeria): Please allow me at the outset to join those who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Knowing your country's particular interest in and concrete contributions to the subject of today's debate, my delegation is confident that the deliberations of the Council will be conducted with skill and wisdom, and in a manner that will enhance the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

Maintaining and restoring international peace and security is a fundamental purpose of the United Nations. When, in October of this year, my delegation addressed the General Assembly on the report of the Security Council, we stressed the great importance which we attach to activities the Council undertakes in the discharge of its primary responsibility on matters that directly affect our region. In the past year, the Council devoted about 60 per cent of its activities to conflicts in the continent of Africa.

Today the international community has to deal with an ever increasing number of new conflicts which must be promptly contained. True enough, there has been no large-scale regional conflict; yet many local wars have continued, and Africa has had more than its fair share. These conflicts have greatly impeded the socio-economic development of the continent, reduced the population to abject poverty and deprivation, created swarms of refugees and internally displaced persons, and generated serious apprehension on the part of the international community about the continent's future. My delegation too is disturbed by this trend of events. We are, however, pleased that the United Nations system is giving special consideration to the root causes of these conflicts, with a view to designing strategies for their resolution. The short-, medium- and long-term consequences of conflicts require a holistic approach that includes the full range of humanitarian and development assistance.

My delegation agrees with the Secretary-General that post-conflict peace-building must involve coordinated and integrated activities that address the root causes of violence, with a view to laying the foundations for a lasting peace. This comprehensive approach, which links peace, security, good governance, respect for human rights and sustainable development, represents a major paradigm shift in the activities of the United Nations. This innovation is quite unique. Nigeria firmly supports all United Nations efforts to strengthen its conflict-prevention and crisis-management capacity, and has always welcomed the initiatives of the Secretary-General in this field. My delegation believes that development is a prerequisite for creating a stable, secure and prosperous society.

As a long-term conflict-prevention strategy, post-conflict peace-building must be vigorously promoted, bearing in mind the specific circumstances of each case. Economic reconstruction, the rehabilitation of basic health and education facilities, and the safety of lives and property should help to ensure that the cessation of violence is real; these elements will contribute to the consolidation of peace, which is a prerequisite for sustainable growth and development.

Peace and prosperity are mutually reinforcing. The participation of donor Governments, non-governmental organizations and host Governments in this process has been critical to the successes witnessed in many regions, especially in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) subregion.

In Sierra Leone and Liberia, the United Nations and the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) are deeply involved in post-conflict peace-building activities. They monitor human rights violations and help the Governments to implement their disarmament and demobilization tasks. This kind of cooperation between the Security Council and a regional organization, already envisaged in the Charter, deserves recognition and support.

Finally, my delegation hereby requests the Security Council not to relent in its efforts to provide ECOMOG with the logistic, financial and technical assistance that it sorely requires to execute its mandate in our subregion. In this regard, I wish to draw the Council's attention to relevant presidential statements and to resolution 1216 (1998), adopted only two days ago, on the implementation of the Abuja Accord with regard to the crisis in Guinea-Bissau, signed by President Joao Bernardo Vieira and the Commander of the Self-Proclaimed Military Junta, General Ansumane Mane.

Although the ceasefire is holding, the situation is tense and could erupt at any time. Rapid deployment of ECOMOG interposition forces is critical to the restoration and consolidation of peace in that country. However, ECOWAS member States lack the means to do this. This explains the appeal to the international community to enable ECOMOG to undertake an operation of that magnitude. Although it is an internal crisis, it has the potential to threaten the peace and security of the ECOWAS subregion. Timely response to this request, therefore, will help nip this incipient crisis in the bud. We are more aware today of the risks associated with dispatching operations with inadequate resources. We have also learned that inaction in the face of a threat to international peace and security anywhere in the world is unacceptable.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Nigeria for the kind words he addressed to me. The next speaker is the representative of Slovakia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Varso (Slovakia): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I would also like to thank your predecessor, the representative of the United States, for his effective leadership of the Security Council during the month of November.

Slovakia fully supports and has aligned itself with the statement of the European Union delivered earlier today by the representative of Austria. Allow me to make a few additional comments on behalf of my delegation.

The maintenance of international peace and security is, and will remain, one of the primary purposes of the United Nations. The experiences and achievements of the Organization in fulfilling this goal have shown that, although conflicts take a variety of forms, peacekeeping operations are one of the key instruments available to the United Nations to resolve those conflicts.

Slovakia shares the Secretary-General's view, expressed in his report on Africa, that peacekeeping operations in their various forms can be critical confidence-building measures. Judging from recent experience, it would seem that the multidimensional and interactive approach to peacekeeping as such is inevitable.

Slovakia has been participating in United Nations peacekeeping operations since its establishment as an independent State in January 1993. The active and successful participation of Slovak troops, serving under the United Nations flag in the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES), particularly in the area of engineering, has been recognized by the relevant authorities of the United Nations. Having obtained this practical experience in Eastern Slavonia, the Slovak Republic has offered its engineering units to support and strengthen the demining capability of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara.

Moreover, Slovakia has also been involved in peacekeeping missions in Jerusalem, Angola and, recently, in the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights. In this regard, I would like to reiterate the intention and readiness of my country to increase, in close cooperation with Austria, its participation in UNDOF.

Regional arrangements have already become an integral part of the common effort of the international community to maintain peace and security in various parts of the world. Slovakia supports increasing cooperation between the United Nations and the regional organizations, especially in the area of early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and resolution, and post-conflict rehabilitation. As far as the European region is concerned, the Government of the Slovak Republic has recently approved the contribution of Slovakia, both financial and in personnel, to the Verification Mission in Kosovo and has also endorsed the participation of Slovak troops in the Stabilization Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

By the same token, the United Nations and the international community should provide assistance to those regional arrangements which, for various reasons, lack sufficient resources and expertise to face conflict situations in their regions. We welcome all efforts for improving peacekeeping training capacity aimed at enhancing the peacekeeping capacity of individual regions and their countries, in close cooperation with respective regional organizations. Slovakia is ready to contribute to these efforts through its Peacekeeping Training Centre, providing, in particular, training for combat engineers.

No doubt, the consolidation of peace in the post-conflict period is one of the most important steps in reducing the risk of the resumption of conflict. Peace-building efforts should address various factors of conflict and contribute to the creation of conditions for reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery. Post-conflict peace-building activities must be aimed at promoting a durable peace and sustainable development through, *inter alia*, humanitarian and development activities, confidence-building measures, the strengthening of democratic institutions and respect for human rights.

We have learned from many examples that humanitarian assistance plays a very important role at all stages of conflict and that it is an irreplaceable supplement to the comprehensive action of the international community in the peaceful settlement of disputes. In the prevention phase, it can significantly help to reduce the threat of conflict; during an ongoing conflict, it can prevent or reduce human suffering; and humanitarian assistance in the post-conflict stage helps to strengthen a durable peace. In most cases, the essential element of humanitarian assistance is a mine-action plan. Slovakia has done a lot, especially in mine clearance, during its participation in peacekeeping. We are developing our own mine-clearance programme and are ready to provide our skills, techniques and equipment and to participate in any activity of the international community in this regard.

However, we believe that an essential element of the settlement of conflicts is political will. The parties and countries concerned must show the will to rely upon political rather than military responses to problems and the will for good governance. On the other hand, the appropriate approach is also needed from the international community and Member States should show the willingness to act and to provide the United Nations with the necessary resources to handle conflicts.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Slovakia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): It is a particular pleasure for Bangladesh to see you, Sir, a wise and capable diplomat, presiding over the Council's deliberations on this important subject.

Bangladesh commends the timely initiative of the Security Council in convening this meeting. This gives the States Members of the United Nations an opportunity to come up with ideas on how best the cause of international peace and security can be served and also how best the issue of post-conflict peace-building can be addressed. Our deliberations will help identify areas that are of interest to the United Nations and the international community.

The international situation today remains fluid. A climate of uncertainty persists. Commitments made in some major areas of international cooperation remain to be fulfilled. The interests of developing countries surely warrant high priority. The gap between the developed and developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, continues to widen. The problems that derive from poverty and social injustices are in many instances being compounded. Underdevelopment, poverty and social injustice constitute a source of frustration and even a possible cause of new conflicts. Stability, security, democracy and peace are far from being consolidated on a global scale. That will require a reversal of growing international inequalities. Disputes among nations and also within nations, violent conflicts, aggression, foreign occupation and interference in the internal affairs of States continue to frustrate the object of peaceful coexistence of States and peoples.

As we look at the nature of the conflicts and social strife that the world is experiencing today, we notice that inter-State wars and foreign occupation have been on the decline since the end of the cold war. This encouraging development is expected to contribute to the lessening of violence in the long run. However, intra-State conflicts, social strife, deprivation, abuses of human rights, ethnic aggrandizement and xenophobia continue to pose problems that result in violence and impinge on international peace and security.

International peace and security can best be strengthened by the actions not just of States but also of men and women, through the inculcation of a culture of peace and non-violence in every human being and in every sphere of activity. The elements of a culture of peace draw on age-old principles and values which are respected and held in high esteem by all peoples and societies. The objective of a culture of peace is the empowerment of people. It contributes effectively to the overcoming of authoritarian structures, and the accompanying exploitation, through democratic participation. It works against poverty and inequality and promotes development. It celebrates diversity, advances understanding and tolerance and reduces inequality between men and women. We regard the culture of peace as an effective expedient to minimize and prevent violence and conflict in the present-day world.

Over countless millenniums, humankind has failed to abolish or do away with war. Indeed, such eminent persons as Nobel Laureates Lester Pearson and Bertrand Russell have expressed the view that some people may even be thrilled at the prospect of war. What is clearly needed, therefore, as the eminent American philosopher William James said, decades before the United Nations came into existence, is something that is the moral equivalent of war — something that would be as heroic to people as war has often been depicted to be, but that is also compatible with the essential human spirit, which war emphatically is not. That is the need that the culture of peace strives to fulfil.

Conflicts in developing countries have their roots in poverty, hunger, ignorance, economic deprivation and lack of accountability in the use of political power. We need to address the root causes of conflict in a comprehensive and holistic manner.

The maintenance of international peace and security will depend in large measure on favourable conditions for durable peace after military conflict. The transition from peacekeeping to peace-building obviously needs the close attention of the international community. Such a transition, if not properly managed, could seriously undermine peace and security. In fact, we have witnessed societies emerge from conflict situations only to indulge in fresh intra-State or intra-group conflicts. That is an aspect of peace and security and peace-building that cannot be overemphasized.

In the wars and conflicts of today the parties involved quite often resort to actions which constitute flagrant violations of human rights and international laws, particularly humanitarian laws. The weaker and vulnerable groups of society become easy and innocent victims of conflicts. Abuses of the rights of women and children are most common. In this regard, we welcome the role being played by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict. We also endorse the idea of treating children in conflict situations as zones of peace.

Bangladesh is committed to the cause of international peace and security. We have been a major contributor to the peacekeeping and peacemaking efforts of the United Nations and are prepared to work constructively with Member States in the promotion of the objectives of the United Nations Charter.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Bangladesh for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Indonesia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia): I join previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, the very able and skilful Ambassador of Bahrain, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. My congratulations are also addressed to the Ambassador of the United States on his excellent work as President of the Security Council for the month of November.

It was the expectation of the international community that the end of the cold war would lead to a lower level of regional conflict. Unfortunately, however, such conflicts, especially in the form of intra-State strife, have registered a substantial increase during the past few years. It is therefore of the utmost importance for the Organization to be able to prevent and contain the resurgence and escalation of conflicts, with their attendant consequences.

Hence, the issues of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building continue to be the *raison d'être* of the United Nations, the reason for its very existence, especially in the changing context of the regional and international milieu. Beyond doubt, all Member States share the view that the pursuit of peace, security, development and prosperity is of paramount importance as we approach the new millennium. My delegation considers that discussion on these interlinked issues should be carried out within the framework of the Organization's agenda and under the respective competence of the various organs. Meanwhile, we need to devise a more viable system of collective security, as envisioned in the Charter, in which all Member States can participate in accordance with their respective capabilities. In that way, the burden of making the world safer for all would be equitably shared by all.

In this context, we have noted the recent proposal by the Secretary-General to broaden the role of the Security Council by invoking Article 65 of the Charter because of the increasing need for the Council to be provided with accurate and relevant information on economic, social and humanitarian crises that threaten international peace and security. We share his view that only efforts to resolve underlying socio-economic, cultural and humanitarian problems can place the achievement of peace on a durable foundation. However, Indonesia deems it proper and appropriate that any action by the Council in this sphere must be taken in conjunction with the Charter-mandated role and responsibilities of the wider membership, which is reflected in the General Assembly. This position is analogous to the one taken by the Non-Aligned Movement at its summit meeting held in Durban, South Africa, last September, which held that without prejudice to the competence of the other principal organs of the United Nations with regard to their respective roles in post-conflict peace-building, the Assembly must have the key role in decision-making.

Maintaining peace and security, whether in a conflict area or a potential conflict area, needs concerted and coordinated efforts by international and regional organizations and, more importantly, by the disputing parties. If these activities are conducted within the framework of Chapter VIII of the Charter, regional organizations can make a distinct contribution to the Security Council's efforts to seek peaceful solutions. It is also an undeniable truism that in efforts to resolve conflicts and to maintain peace and stability, regional organizations, for geographical, historical and other reasons, are uniquely placed to propose viable solutions. Close cooperation and coordination between the regional organizations and the Security Council could substantially enhance the prospects for the political settlement of disputes without intervening in matters that are deemed to be the internal affairs of States.

Concurrently, we should also recognize that prolonging conflicts, especially those involving armaments, only brings increased hardship and suffering to the people. Of equal importance is that neither the United Nations nor regional organizations can impose preventive measures on conflicting States or parties without their consent. Such endeavours, if undertaken at the request of the parties or Governments concerned, have a greater chance of success. The request for, or at least acquiescence in, action by regional or international organizations is *conditio sine qua non* from the legal as well as the political perspective.

Indonesia is fully aware that the 16 United Nations peacekeeping missions dispatched during 1998, comprising 14,500 civilian and military personnel from 77 countries, including Indonesia, primarily deal with conflicts within States. These conflicts have resulted in half the world's war-related fatalities and have displaced millions of people. Nevertheless, it is of utmost importance that the traditional concept of peacekeeping operations be maintained. Such operations can be and still are useful if they are undertaken with the support of the overall membership of the Organization, are launched with the consent of all the parties involved and have a precise and realistic mandate within a specific time-frame setting out the main political objectives. It is equally essential that they be in full conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, such as sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, as well as the recommendations and conclusions of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

The transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peace- building is critical. It must be aimed at eliminating the factors that contributed to the strife and, more importantly, that contribute to the risk of a resumption of conflict, in order to create conditions more conducive to reconstruction and rehabilitation. It also calls for measures to ensure the security of civilians and an adequate infrastructure to more clearly define post-conflict peace-building needs and ways of meeting them.

In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the maintenance of peace calls for a well-structured programme, especially in the complex task of post-conflict peace-building, which requires a comprehensive and concerted approach encompassing, among other things, the transformation of armed movements into civilian mechanisms, the restructuring of the police and armed forces, strengthening the national judicial system, demining and, most important of all, national reconciliation through confidence- building measures, as well as international support for elections, the eradication of poverty and the promotion of democracy, sustainable development and respect for human rights. It is of crucial importance that, in the implementation of such steps by the international community, equal attention should be given to all post-conflict regions in providing aid and assistance, while the form of development chosen by the country should be respected.

In conclusion, the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building encompass many aspects, including economic development and social and humanitarian aspects, rather than solely military ones, and hence should not be the exclusive responsibility of the Security Council. They call for a multifaceted approach that requires the effective integration of the political, security, socio-economic and humanitarian dimensions. They should complement and be harmonious with each other. This calls for greater coordination and interaction between the General Assembly and the Security Council, which would serve greater unity of purpose and coherence of efforts.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Indonesia for the kinds words he addressed to me and to my predecessor.

The next speaker is the representative of Ukraine. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Yel'chenko (Ukraine): First of all, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your effective presidency of the Security Council, and in particular on your timely initiative in convening this meeting. I would also like to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Burleigh, for the excellent job he did last month.

Last Wednesday the open debate in the Security Council on the agenda item before it was suspended because of the situation in Iraq. The events of the past week, which are still awaiting the official reaction of the Council, made us all — let us be honest — take a new look at the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security. In view of this, a thematic, theoretical consideration of the agenda item before the Council today is indeed quite a difficult task.

Nevertheless, we believe that discussion of the various aspects of United Nations post-conflict peace-building activities in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security may provide a fresh assessment of those activities against the background of continuing changes in the international environment and the ongoing transformation of the United Nations itself.

The end of the cold war obliged the United Nations to enhance its role in global burden-sharing for peace by adapting its peacekeeping activities to emerging realities and new types of conflicts. As a result of this evolution, a second generation of United Nations peacekeeping operations — with multifunctional mandates, including assistance to war-torn societies in moving from violent conflict towards national reconciliation, economic reconstruction and democratic consolidation — came into being; this actually gave birth to post-conflict peace-building.

It is known that in the course of the last decade the United Nations accumulated valuable experience in this field. One may recall United Nations missions in Cambodia, Croatia, El Salvador, Mozambique and elsewhere. A United Nations post-conflict presence is at present maintained in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Haiti, Sierra Leone, Western Sahara and other countries or areas.

Ukraine has continuously contributed to such collective international efforts. As a matter of fact, representatives of our country have participated in a number of United Nations missions under post-conflict peace-building mandates, including those to Angola, Croatia, Guatemala, Mozambique and South Africa. Currently, representatives of Ukraine serve with United Nations missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Angola. For the last few years, Ukrainian observers have been serving with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) mission in Georgia. Today, Ukraine is contributing its personnel to the OSCE Verification Mission in Kosovo. Ukraine also remains one of the guarantor States of the peaceful settlement of the Transdniestrian conflict, Republic of Moldova.

The evolution over the past decade of United Nations peacekeeping practice highlights the need for further development of its theory as well. In this regard, "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111), submitted by the Secretary-General in 1992, and its Supplement of 1995 (S/1995/1) provided a solid theoretical foundation for the strengthening of United Nations capacities in maintaining international peace and security, including the concept of post-conflict peace-building.

Ukraine supported that process and took an active part in the deliberations of the four sub-groups of the General Assembly Working Group on An Agenda for Peace. Although the discussion in the sub-group on post-conflict peace-building demonstrated the existence of different views with regard to the problem of the competence and responsibilities of the principal bodies of the United Nations in this field, Ukraine believes that those differences are not insurmountable. Therefore, it would be a welcome development should this meeting of the Security Council contribute to the resumption of efforts aimed at the elaboration of a strategic framework for post-conflict peace-building activities.

This year we have already witnessed several encouraging steps undertaken within the United Nations in that direction. I refer, first of all, to the submission by the Secretary-General of a very important report, entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318), which, *inter alia*, spotlighted the increasing significance of post-conflict peace-building and the need for its further consideration by both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

In our view, post-conflict peace-building activities have a special place among the tools for maintaining international peace and security, since they are designed to address comprehensively the political, economic, social and humanitarian problems of States in the wake of conflicts. Besides, such activities are undertaken, as a rule, only after other international peace support tools have been used in the areas of conflict. This makes the mandates of the post-conflict peace-building missions highly complicated, since they must either finalize the success, or compensate for the underachievements, of the previous missions. Therefore, we believe that in formulating the future mandates of post-conflict peace-building missions, more attention should be paid to the various preconditions of their deployment.

In the same vein, my delegation is of the view that parallel approaches should be pursued in launching post-conflict peace-building activities with a view to eliminating the different consequences of both intra- and inter-State conflicts.

We share the broadly held view that there is no standard post-conflict peace-building model. However, we strongly believe that any such activities should be carried out in full accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, at the request and on the basis of consent of the conflicting parties and with their full commitment to the cause of reconciliation, civilian reconstruction and durable peace.

My delegation remains convinced that the United Nations should continue to play a primary role as the coordinator and originator of guidelines for the post-conflict process, with the involvement of regional organizations.

The United Nations, which is like no other organization in existence, offers the best framework to this end. In this context, Ukraine maintains that constant political monitoring by the United Nations of the process of formation of the new states which, as a rule, emerge as a result of conflicts should be an integral part of the Organization's post-conflict peace-building strategies. We also deem necessary that such monitoring be performed by a specialized organ of the United Nations — for instance, the Trusteeship Council. In the light of the ongoing discussions about the further existence of this body, we may find that one way to revitalize its activities could be to assign to it a new mandate and to reconsider its title.

The wide range of United Nations activities in this area requires an integrated and coordinated approach in order to ensure the success of post-conflict peace-building. As we all are aware, the programme for reform initiated last year by the Secretary-General did not pass by United Nations post-conflict peace-building efforts. We are confident that thanks to the innovations introduced — primarily the designation of the Department of Political Affairs as the United Nations focal point for post-conflict peace-building — United Nations efforts in this area have become more coherent and comprehensive. The Security Council may wish to take this opportunity to request the Secretary-General to reflect on proposals for further improvements in this field.

I should like to conclude by expressing once again the hope that the outcome of our debate will contribute to the further development of the conceptual and operational framework of the United Nations post-conflict peace-building activities.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Ukraine for the kind words he addressed to me and to my predecessor, Ambassador Burleigh.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Crighton (Australia): I am grateful, Mr. President, for the opportunity to contribute to the debate.

The maintenance of international peace and security is, of course, a core function of the United Nations. Primary responsibility for this function has been entrusted to the Security Council. It is a solemn responsibility, but it is not solely the responsibility of the Council. It is one shared by all Members of the United Nations.

It is in this light — and in view of our strong wish for greater openness and transparency in the working methods of the Council — that Australia particularly appreciates the initiative to convene this formal meeting to discuss an issue that is of direct concern to all of us.

The maintenance of international peace and security encompasses many things. Conventionally it is seen as the range of cooperative activities undertaken by the international community when a dispute is emerging or a conflict has erupted. These activities can range from preventive diplomacy to peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building. It can also require peace enforcement.

We also know that other factors bear upon the maintenance of international peace and security. Poverty, ethnic differences, abuses of human rights, breakdowns in governance and access to fundamental freedoms, among others, are as much causes of dispute and conflict as more traditional ones such as territorial claims, ideology or access to natural resources. Maintaining peace and security requires that we address them, because failure to deal with the underlying causes of conflict will only ensure that peace will not be sustainable.

Social and economic development goals are, to state the obvious, an equally important and central part of United Nations activities. But all too often the tendency has been to see them as something different, activities apart — as, perhaps, a competing part of the United Nations agenda rather than as an integral part of its role in the maintenance of peace and security.

The experience of the United Nations over the last 50 years, particularly in intra-State conflicts, demonstrates that a more integrated, holistic approach is critical to our efforts to maintain international peace and security. A fragmented approach — dealing with peacemaking, peacekeeping, economic development, humanitarian assistance, refugees, institution-building and so on as though they were unconnected — will not work. The pieces need to be pulled together.

In practice, of course, this is no easy task. Creating the right political circumstances alone is demanding. It requires a high level of cooperation between the parties concerned. It requires a shared understanding about national goals and priorities. It requires a significant commitment of resources. It requires strong political and practical commitment from the full membership. And it requires a high level of cooperation and coordination between the various arms of the United Nations and other international agencies.

It is also true that the distinction between peacekeeping and peace-building is blurred, and the transition from one to the next is not simply like passing the baton in a relay. In practice there must be a substantial peace-building element to peacekeeping. Traditional peacekeepers can now be called on to perform a multifunctional role, for example assisting in the organization and conduct of elections or helping to meet urgent social, economic and institutional development needs.

In each case the needs will be different, and in each case the United Nations must be able to respond flexibly and realistically. We do not see this as redefining or reinterpreting the role of the Security Council, or giving it responsibilities that are rightly within the competence of other parts of the Organization. Rather, we see it as a challenge to the Organization as a whole and to the membership. The challenge is to develop what others have appropriately called a strategic framework, to give coherence to all the activities of the United Nations.

I stress, however, that the United Nations cannot do it alone. The United Nations contribution will be only as effective as the support it gets from the local parties and populations themselves. Without their full participation and cooperation, political and practical, the United Nations role and effectiveness will be heavily circumscribed. There is an important role here for regional organizations, which have the most direct interest in seeing tensions relieved, problems resolved and reconstruction begun. In Australia's own region, in the Asia-Pacific area, the United Nations Political Office in Bougainville is a very good current example of a small mission operating in support of a local and regional peace process.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate my Government's appreciation that this debate is taking place, and we thank you, Sir, for organizing it. It is a welcome response to the increasingly strong calls from the wider membership for greater openness and transparency in the way the Council works.

We understand and we accept that the Council cannot always debate issues in this way. We acknowledge that there are times when the need for speed, decisiveness and confidentiality are paramount. But it is equally true that there are many issues on which the Council can benefit from exposure to the views of the wider membership. We see more dialogue of this kind as a valuable and perhaps essential part of the process of modernization of the institutions of the United Nations, and as a vital aspect of maintaining the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations as a whole.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Australia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The last speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sharma (India): Post-conflict peace-building is a concept on which it appears that the only intergovernmental agreement is that we should speak on it for seven minutes. To respect this agreement I will cut my statement short, but I shall make available to delegations a fuller written version.

As the President of the General Assembly at its fifty-second session observed in his note of 7 August 1998, the main problem has been disagreement over assigning the key role for post-conflict peace-building to the General Assembly.

The Non-Aligned summit in Durban reiterated that the General Assembly must have the key role in the formulation of peace-building activities. In our view, the Security Council should not mandate peace-building activities until the General Assembly has laid down policy through universal intergovernmental deliberations.

India understands the argument that security has a broader context. But the Security Council is comparable to a Home Ministry in a national Government: it has an enlightened policing function. All Governments know that the tensions that sometimes explode in riots or civil unrest have social and economic roots; once order is restored, democratic Governments urgently address the causes of discontent. However, it is not the Home Ministry that authorizes the economic and social programmes needed for a long-term cure. There are, of course, exceptions where those in charge of security take decisions also on economic and social issues; these are called police States.

The Council is a purely political body. Its decisions reflect a balance of interests and power which is not constant. If the Council tries to build peace, its blueprint will either reflect the ideology of dominant members — in cases where others have no interest — or a hodgepodge, where conflicting views have to be reconciled. In neither case is this calculated to help the country concerned.

Perhaps the clearest analysis of peace-building so far was made last year by the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, which identified three core needs essential to peace-building, these being security, well-being and justice. Of these, the Security Council can legitimately address the first. The Commission's view was that there were three main sources of insecurity:

> "the threat posed by nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; the possibility of conventional confrontation between militaries; and internal violence, such as terrorism, organized crime, insurgency and repressive regimes".

Of these, as the Commission also noted, the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons is the most destabilizing threat, both to international peace and security and to peace-building. Unfortunately, the permanent members of the Security Council are the ones that possess, and continue to refine, the largest nuclear arsenals. Unless they agree to dismantle those arsenals, there will be no true peace-building.

On violent conflicts fought with conventional weapons, the Commission noted,

> "The global arms trade in advanced weapons is dominated by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council ...".

Again, the Security Council has much reason for introspection.

If the Council gets into the business of promoting well-being, and tries to guide post-conflict development activities, problems may be expected to follow. Among many other questions, the Council should consider the following.

What development paradigm will it follow? A choice among alternative strategies is a function of sovereignty. The imposition by the United Nations, on the instructions of the Council, of a particular paradigm may not only be resented; it could in fact exacerbate the economic and social tensions that created the political problems in the first place. Misguided peace-building could build frictions, leading to a fresh cycle of violence.

More than once, United Nations peacekeepers used to provide humanitarian assistance have been perceived as partisan, and their attempts to help have inflamed passions rather than dampening them. The same problems are inherent in peace-building. Once aid is perceived as biased, it becomes part of the problem; it fuels conflict; it does not build peace.

The distinction between the mandates of the United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies and those of the Security Council must not be blurred. They should execute only those activities authorized by their governing boards and stick to the expertise they have developed over the years.

When the Council began its discussions last week on the concept of post-conflict peace-building, we had prepared for a debate in general terms. However, the attack on Iraq over the last week has thrown up fundamental problems and questions which must be addressed. We are faced with a conflict resulting from unilateral action by some members of the Council. The international community might have its own views on how peace can be built in Iraq and its neighbourhood, and the Security Council as a whole may be sensitive to these views, but the views of the vast majority of countries do not find the receptivity they deserve among the members of the Council.

This in turn has two possible consequences. Either the Council will be unable to act, and will therefore lose its moral authority, or it will be propelled in a direction that does not conform either to the realities of the situation or to the wishes of the international community.

There is, of course, also the continuing danger that the Security Council will be bypassed on the grounds that its authorization is not needed. In none of these cases would the Council be discharging its obligations under Article 24 of the Charter. The creeping misuse of the Security Council for purposes not part of its mandate is certain to lower the Council's standing. We hope that all members of the Council will realize this.

The attack on Iraq also raises once again the question of the validity or the usefulness of sanctions. In Iraq, sanctions were used as a tool for peace-building, to ensure that Iraq did not have either stockpiles of, or the means to produce, weapons of mass destruction. However, if peace-building also means, as it must, addressing the needs of the populations affected by conflict, sanctions, as in the case of Iraq, clearly thwart this objective. The international community's goal is to ensure that Iraq and its neighbours live in peace with each other, that the events of the 1980s and 1990s are not repeated and that Iraq is enabled to join the comity of nations. Only this would truly build peace.

Again, the Council is faced with a choice: either it asserts its authority and takes such practical decisions on sanctions as would truly build peace, or it might find that its ability to lead the international community is impaired. After all, agencies and programmes of the United Nations system have detailed the horror of what sanctions have wrought in Iraq.

According to the United Nations Children's Fund, 90,000 deaths each year are directly attributable to the effects of sanctions, which means three quarters of a million killed so far; 1 million children under the age of five are chronically malnourished; and education has been shattered, with 84 per cent of schools needing rehabilitation and enrolment down sharply.

According to the World Health Organization, the health system is close to collapse. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/World Food Programme, there has been a significant deterioration in agriculture, which needs attention and investments that cannot be given to it under the oil-for-food programme.

In the interests of peace, if not in the name of humanity, the Security Council has to realize that this is not a crisis that can be allowed to drag on indefinitely or to deepen. There has to be a policy towards closure which respects both Security Council resolutions and the human dignity of the people of Iraq.

The events which led to the attack on Iraq also make it clear that the personalities and actions of those most closely involved in post-conflict peace building are crucial to success. By and large, the Secretary-General and the international community have been very well served by those international civil servants who have been made primarily responsible for post-conflict peace-building. Exceptions make it clear how crucial their role is and how sensitive and delicate a charge it is to carry out responsibilities which have a critical bearing on building peace in regions of conflict, and to avoid coming under suspicion of serving agendas other than international peace and security.

We thank you, Mr. President, for your initiative in enabling us to consider this important item.

The President *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

I thank the representatives of States who have made statements. I believe that the number of speakers, both in the formal meeting held on Wednesday, 16 December, and today, reflects the great attention that is given to the subject of the close and logical links between peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building.

Many good ideas have been put forward. I hope that the Security Council will benefit from such views when taking its decisions relating to international peace and security.

The Security Council will take whatever action it deems necessary in its decision-making to translate such ideas into concrete actions.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3955

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

Provisional

3955th Meeting

Wednesday, 16 December 1998, 9.30 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Buallay	(Bahrain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Amorim
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Costa Rica	Mr. Niehaus
	France	Mr. Dejammet
	Gabon	Mr. Essonghé
	Gambia	Mr. Jagne
	Japan	Mr. Konishi
	Kenya	Mr. Mahugu
	Portugal	Mr. Monteiro
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Slovenia	Mr. Türk
	Sweden	Mr. Dahlgren
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Burleigh

Agenda

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

Letter dated 15 December 1998 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/1172)

98-86710 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

Letter dated 15 December 1998 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/1172)

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Iraq, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hamdoon (Iraq) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the letter dated 15 December 1998 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/1998/1172.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/1998/1173, which contains the text of a letter dated 15 December 1998 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the letter dated 14 December 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and its enclosure.

Members of the Council have received photocopies of the following communications: letter dated 16 December 1998 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, which will be issued as document S/1998/1175; letter dated 16 December 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of the United States Mission to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, which will be issued as document S/1998/1181; and letter dated 16 December 1998 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, which will be issued as document S/1998/1182.

The first speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Iraq. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hamdoon (Iraq)(*interpretation from Arabic*): I speak to you now while rockets and bombs are falling on the cities and the villages of Iraq, Iraq that is steadfast and patient. I am not speaking in symbolic language or about a fireworks display in the Baghdad sky which is being enjoyed by CNN viewers. Indeed, I am speaking about bombs that are falling at this very moment to rip out the hearts of elderly men and women and extinguish smiles from the faces of children and scatter their limbs everywhere. These are instruments of destruction that are reaping the lives of Iraqi civilians who have been suffering for the past eight years from one of the most comprehensive and horrendous sanctions known in human history.

The aggression launched by the United States and Britain today is the most glaring evidence of the absence of principles in international relations and of the submission of the world to the authority of brute power. Indeed, this is a very grim and sad day in the history of the United Nations and the Security Council. At a time when the Security Council, with the participation of the Secretary-General, was discussing reports submitted by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) on the status of compliance by Iraq, and before the Council reached any conclusion on this subject, the United States and Britain launched their attack against Iraq. The two Powers requested a suspension of the informal meeting of the Security Council and their pretext for aggression was that one of the two reports — the UNSCOM report — emphasized the lack of full cooperation by Iraq with UNSCOM. Thus, the United States has once again arrogated to itself the Security Council's authority and flouted international law and the United Nations Charter. Indeed, it has disregarded the prestige of the members of the Council, who were in session and were not allowed to even complete their discussion, in keeping with their responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security.

Time and again we have warned against the partiality and lack of objectivity of the United Nations Special Commission. The conduct of the UNSCOM Executive Chairman yesterday and today provided additional evidence that his partiality, lack of integrity and lack of objectivity as an international civil servant could indeed lead the world to disasters, the first victims of which would be the United Nations and its prestige. The UNSCOM Executive Chairman singled out in his report yesterday five incidents out of a total of 300 inspection operations; I repeat, five incidents of 300 inspection operations that have been undertaken since UNSCOM resumed its operations in Iraq on 18 November. He considered those incidents as categorical evidence of lack of cooperation on Iraq's part. What are these incidents? One is that the Iraqi side requested UNSCOM to respect the Muslim religious holiday on Fridays. Another was that the Iraqi side took inspectors to the headquarters of a non-Iraqi organization and the officers of that organization denied the inspectors access to their headquarters. A third incident was that UNSCOM inspectors entered a site where they were expecting to find what was presumed to be documents and they failed to find such documents because those documents were not there.

Another incident relates to the "air force" document, which we invited him to discuss jointly, in the presence of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General. He refused to do so. Yet another incident relates to a visit to the party headquarters, in which a party representative requested a written request — just a few lines — to inspect the party headquarters. They refused to do so. And to complete his non-objective conclusions with regard to cooperation by Iraq, the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission today, without the knowledge or approval of the Security Council — without its knowledge or approval — withdrew his inspectors from Iraq in order to pave the way completely for the military aggression against Iraq by the United States and the United Kingdom.

The exaggerated uproar about Iraqi weapons of mass destruction is nothing but a great lie; the other lie is the allegation that Iraq poses a threat to its neighbours. With regard to weapons of mass destruction, UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency have been operating since April 1991, with cooperation from the Iraqi side, and have completed their essential work in the area of disarmament. The International Atomic Energy Agency announced recently that the disarmament phase has virtually been completed, and UNSCOM declared that it was about to complete that phase with regard to missiles and chemical weapons, a month being set by the Chairman of UNSCOM to do so.

The question that arises is, where are the prohibited weapons which they allege that Iraq still has? If UNSCOM has any evidence that Iraq possesses a prohibited weapon or its components, then we challenge them, as we have done in the past, to provide physical evidence to the Security Council. Indeed, some members of the Security Council have requested, time and again, that such evidence be submitted, but UNSCOM has failed to do so.

With regard to the threat posed by Iraq to its neighbours — and there is a well-known exception in this context — we ask the Security Council to tell us which of Iraq's neighbouring States claims that Iraq is threatening its peace and security. Indeed, we would pose another question: what has the Security Council done in the face of the threats to the peace and security of Iraq made every day by some permanent members of the Security Council, and of other threats posed by another neighbouring country?

In closing, I invite the Security Council to fulfil its responsibilities as set forth in the United Nations Charter and request an immediate and unconditional cessation of the aggression that is under way against Iraq. Furthermore, I remind the Council of the content of the statement issued by the national leadership of my country today: that we are confident that the people of Iraq will prove once again that this aggression is futile and a failure, as they have done in the past with regard to every prior instance of aggression.

Finally, I wish a holy Ramadan to the steadfast Iraqis and to Arabs and Muslims everywhere in the world.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Today's meeting is taking place at a time when Iraq is being subjected to massive missile and bomb strikes by the armed forces of the United States and the United Kingdom. There have been casualties, valuable material goods have been destroyed and a threat has been created to peace and security not only in the region but beyond it. I should like to recall that there are Russian citizens in Baghdad. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Mr. Ivanov, stated today that if their lives should prove to be imperilled, that will have extremely serious consequences.

Grave harm has been done to the tremendous amount of work done in recent years to effect a post-crisis settlement in the Persian Gulf region and to dismantle the capability of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. The very existence of the system that was so carefully set up over a long period of time to monitor the prohibited programmes of Iraq has been called into question. Such a turn of events, to which Russia decidedly objects, has caused very serious concern and deep alarm. In carrying out this unprovoked act of force, the United States and the United Kingdom have grossly violated the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and the generally recognized norms and rules of responsible behaviour on the part of States in the international arena. Essentially, a threat has been made to the entire system of international security, in which the United Nations and the Security Council act as a central link.

The Security Council alone has the right to determine what steps should be taken in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. We reject outright the attempts made in the letters from the United States and the United Kingdom to justify the use of force on the basis of a mandate that was previously issued by the Security Council. The resolutions of the Council provide no grounds whatsoever for such actions.

I should like to recall that paragraph 6 of the most recent resolution of the Security Council on Iraq, resolution 1205 (1998), clearly states that the Security Council

> "*Decides*, in accordance with its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, to remain actively seized of the matter."

Clearly, therefore, those actions have been undertaken in violation of Security Council resolutions. The entire responsibility for the consequences of those actions must be borne by those States that have chosen a unilateral act of force in order to resolve their problems with Iraq. No one is entitled to act independently on behalf of the United Nations, still less assume the functions of a world policeman. Russia has consistently made intensive diplomatic efforts to promote a swift settlement of the situation around Iraq. The potential for a political and diplomatic resolution of the Iraqi crisis has by no means been exhausted, as is made particularly clear by the basically normal course of cooperation between Iraq and the United Nations recently. The Iraqi leadership even now confirms its readiness to continue on that course.

We believe that although there are certain problems regarding the cooperation between Iraq and the United Nations Special Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the current crisis was created artificially, partly as a result of the irresponsible acts of the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission, Richard Butler. On the night of 15 December this year, he presented a report that gave a distorted picture of the real state of affairs and concluded that there was a lack of full cooperation on the part of Iraq. That conclusion was not borne out by the facts. Without any consultations with the Security Council, Richard Butler then evacuated the entire Special Commission staff from Iraq. At the same time, there was an absolutely unacceptable leak of the report to the communications media, which received the text before the members of the Security Council themselves. Richard Butler thus grossly abused his authority. His acts have led to a sharp deterioration of the situation regarding Iraq.

It is symbolic that precisely at the time when Richard Butler, during today's consultative Council meeting, was attempting to defend the conclusions reached in his report, we were informed about the strike against Iraq, and the justification for that unilateral act was precisely the report which had been presented by the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission.

In the light of this new situation in Iraq, the Russian Federation cannot remain unconcerned. We appeal for an immediate end to these acts of military force, that restraint and prudence be demonstrated and that no further escalation of the conflict be allowed, a conflict which is fraught with completely predictable consequences, dangerous not only for the Iraqi settlement but also for international stability as a whole.

We are convinced that the resolution of the Iraqi problem is possible only through political and diplomatic methods on the basis of compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council and the norms of international law.

We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his statement today in which he, *inter alia*, confirmed his readiness to promote a peaceful settlement of the problem in the region of the Persian Gulf.

We believe that the Security Council has its part to play in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, including giving an assessment, in principle, of the current unilateral military action. In this context, today's meeting is of particular significance.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: This afternoon the United States and the United Kingdom started a military attack against Iraq which violated the United Nations Charter and norms governing international law. We were deeply shocked by this act, and we condemn it.

It must be pointed out in particular that with the joint efforts of the Secretary-General and the international community, Iraq had resumed its cooperation with United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and progress had also been made in verification efforts.

Against this backdrop, the unprovoked military action of the two countries is completely groundless. We are deeply concerned over the safety and security of the people of Iraq and the United Nations staff in the country.

We also would like to thank the Secretary-General for the remarks he made today on this question.

The Chinese delegation at the open debate this morning on the question of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building stated that we are against power politics or the unilateral resort to the use or threat of force in international relations. We believe that such acts contravene international law and norms governing international relations and are in themselves a serious threat to international peace and security. These remarks of ours were not without targets.

China has always strongly advocated peaceful settlement of international disputes and is against the use or the threat of use of force in international relations.

The differences that exist between UNSCOM and Iraq on the verification issue can properly be settled through dialogue and consultation. The use of force, far from helping to reach a settlement, may create serious consequences for the implementation of Security Council resolutions, for relations between Iraq and the United Nations and for peace and stability in the world and in the region.

We call upon the United States and the United Kingdom to immediately stop all military actions against Iraq, to avoid any other acts which may worsen the situation and to return to the path of cooperation and dialogue.

The leader of UNSCOM has played a dishonourable role in this crisis. The reports submitted by UNSCOM to the Secretary-General were one-sided and evasive regarding the facts. It is difficult for the UNSCOM leader to shirk his responsibility in the current crisis.

From the letters addressed to the President of the Council by the United States and the United Kingdom, it can be seen that they have taken the relevant UNSCOM reports as the main argument for the use of force against Iraq. Perhaps that was precisely the purpose of those reports, but I must point out that whatever the intention was behind the preparation of the reports by the UNSCOM leader, and however the countries which read them try to make use of them, there is in fact no excuse or reason for the use of force against Iraq.

We believe that only through political and diplomatic means can an appropriate settlement be found to the various contradictions and differences over the question of weapons verification in Iraq.

The United Nations Charter entrusts the Security Council with the main responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. At this crucial moment of war and peace, the Council should shoulder this sacred responsibility. We are ready to join the international community in an effort to this end.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): A few hours ago the armed forces of the United Kingdom, along with those of the United States, took military action in Iraq. This was not a hasty decision.

There has been a long road to this crisis. At any point on that road, Iraq could have chosen to cooperate fully and freely, thereby avoiding the action which we have been forced to take. It is worth looking back down that road to see why we have reached this point.

Security Council resolution 687 (1991), bringing to an end the Gulf War, made it a condition of the ceasefire that Iraq both destroy its weapons of mass destruction and agree to the monitoring of its obligation to destroy such weapons.

Why was this assurance so vital? Because Iraq had, unprovoked, invaded Kuwait. Because in the course of that conflict, Iraq had launched indiscriminate ballistic missile attacks on neighbouring countries. Because Iraq had already shown it was ready and willing to use the most deadly weapons. It used chemical weapons extensively against Iran, and against its own civilians in Halabja in 1988, using mustard gas and the nerve agent tabun, killing thousands of civilians. Saddam Hussein is the only leader ever to have authorized the use of nerve agents. Chemical weapons casualties from the Iran-Iraq war number more than twenty thousand. As was slowly revealed after the Gulf War, Iraq had developed huge quantities of weapons of the most deadly kind.

The United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) was set up to remove Iraq's extensive weapons of mass destruction capabilities and to provide a full and verifiable account of what Iraq had produced and used in the past. To complete this task UNSCOM was, in 1991, given immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to all the areas, facilities, equipment and records it wished to inspect.

But Iraq has never given UNSCOM the cooperation it needed to complete its tasks. Instead, it has concealed the evidence of its past and current programmes and has engaged in a policy of harassment and deceit to thwart UNSCOM in its tasks. Iraq has blocked inspections whenever it feared that anything incriminating would be found. It has failed to produce documents UNSCOM knows to exist, documents that are demonstrably relevant to Iraq's programmes of weapons of mass destruction. Even the infamous "air force" document has yet not been handed over.

Over the past 14 months, Iraq has deliberately provoked a series of crises in an attempt to wear down the will of the international community: in October 1997, February 1998, August 1998 and at the end of October 1998. Each time, they used the withdrawal of cooperation both for further prevarication and for the dispersal of their military capability.

On 14 November, at the last moment and in the knowledge that they were about to be attacked, the Iraqis offered full, unconditional and unrestricted cooperation with UNSCOM. The attack was called off. We willingly made that last extra effort to avert the use of force. But we said at the time that we would hold Saddam Hussein to his word and that, should he break his word once more, there would be no second chances. The Secretary-General added his own words of warning, as did others with channels to Baghdad. Those words were not heeded.

UNSCOM's report makes clear that Iraq has yet again failed to keep its promises. The report details not merely the obstruction but the fact that it relates directly to documents, sites and personnel that would give a clue as to the whereabouts of weapons of mass destruction and the capabilities to make them. It is not obstruction simply for the sake of it, but a plan of deceit to prevent those weapons of mass destruction from being located and destroyed.

UNSCOM has made clear time and again that it can only make progress in clearing up the outstanding questions and establish an effective system of monitoring and verification if Iraq offers real cooperation. Tragically, that cooperation has not been forthcoming. The whole continuing history of concealment and deceit is the reason why we have reached the point of military action.

In this, our objectives are clear: to degrade Iraq's capability to build and use weapons of mass destruction, and to diminish the military threat Iraq poses to its neighbours. The targets chosen, therefore, are targets connected with his military capability, his weapons of mass destruction and his ability to threaten his neighbours.

There is a clear legal basis for military action in the resolutions adopted by the Security Council. Resolution 1154 (1998) made it clear that any violation by Iraq of its obligations to allow the Special Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency unrestricted access would have the severest consequences. That was three resolutions and nine months ago. Resolution 1205 (1998) established that Iraq's decision of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation with the Special Commission was a flagrant violation of resolution 687 (1991), which laid down the conditions for the 1991 ceasefire. By that resolution, therefore, the Council implicitly revived the authorization to use force given in resolution 678 (1990). And Ambassador Butler's report makes clear that, despite its undertakings to rescind the decision of 31 October, Iraq has not only failed to resume full cooperation with the Special Commission but has imposed new restrictions on its work.

The British Prime Minister said in his statement earlier this evening,

> "This action could have been avoided. Since the Gulf war, the entire international community has worked to stop Saddam Hussein from keeping and developing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and from continuing to threaten his neighbours. For the safety and stability of the region and the wider world, he cannot be allowed to do so. If he will not, through reason and diplomacy, abandon his weapons of mass destruction programme, it must be degraded and diminished by military force. Having exhausted all other avenues, there is no realistic alternative".

Mr. Niehaus (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As a small, peaceful, democratic and demilitarized country, Costa Rica has maintained and continues unswervingly to maintain an international policy based on the principle of the rejection of the use of force in relations among States. This long-standing policy is grounded in our own national experience and in the firm conviction that international law is the sole proper and legitimate instrument for addressing and resolving disputes among States.

Over the past two years, Costa Rica, as an elected member of the Security Council, has applied that policy of principle by actively supporting the use in all cases, as a matter of first priority, of the means for the pacific settlement of disputes provided for in Article 33 of the Charter. Moreover, Costa Rica in that same capacity has reaffirmed that recourse to the use of force envisaged as an exceptional measure in Chapter VII, Article 42, of the Charter falls within the sole and exclusive purview of the Security Council, and that only this principal organ of the United Nations can authorize collective action of that kind.

In that context, Costa Rica learned with great and profound disquiet of the air strikes carried out today by the United States of America and the United Kingdom against military installations in Baghdad, Iraq. Given those events, Costa Rica reaffirms its long-standing position rejecting the unilateral use of force and insisting on adherence to international legal instruments.

Nonetheless, Costa Rica wishes to say that over these two years it has witnessed with frustration the Iraqi Government policy of defying and ignoring international obligations. That dangerous conduct by the Iraqi authorities has undermined full implementation of Security Council resolutions on the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction in the possession of Iraq, has sapped international trust in Iraq's good word, has profoundly harmed the living conditions of the country's civilian population, and has driven Iraq's relations with the international community into a dead end.

Hence, Costa Rica forcefully and vigorously appeals to Iraq to put an end, once and for all and unconditionally, to its provocative actions, to fulfil its obligations without delay in conformity with the terms set by the Security Council, and to bring its conduct into line with what it has undertaken to do and with its promises to the international community.

Costa Rica today appeals to all parties concerned to do everything in their power to make possible, through intensive recourse to the law and to diplomacy, a peaceful solution to the present crisis.

Mr. Türk (Slovenia): Tonight's meeting is a sombre occasion to reflect on a development that we had all been trying to avoid for quite some time. This year alone, the Security Council was repeatedly confronted with crises in its relations with Iraq. Laudable efforts by the Secretary-General, by the Security Council as a whole and by several of its members more than once created hope that full implementation of Iraqi obligations under the Security Council resolutions would be achieved by peaceful means. On the other hand, already earlier this year, at the time of endorsement of the Secretary-General's Memorandum of Understanding reached with Iraq, the Council made it clear, in its resolution 1154 (1998) of 2 March 1998, that any violation of its obligations would have the severest consequences for Iraq.

That was a clear message of the seriousness the Council has attached to the disarmament work in Iraq. It was also but one in a series of opportunities provided by the Council to Iraq to de-escalate tensions and to proceed with the unfinished business of disarmament. Unfortunately, Iraq failed to take full advantage of those opportunities.

It is deplorable that we find ourselves today in a situation characterized by military action against Iraq. We would have preferred instead to be in a position to proceed immediately with a comprehensive review, for which the Security Council was patiently and diligently working in the past few months. We particularly regret that the Iraqi leadership themselves have prevented that review by failing to live up to their latest unequivocal commitment of 14 November 1998 to full and unconditional cooperation. It should have been clear to them that the perpetuation of crises could sooner rather than later lead to a forceful action. They should have understood better the repeatedly and unanimously stated position of the Security Council that hindering the disarmament work is not acceptable.

We have reached the point where it is difficult to predict how the Council could best deal with Iraq in future. At this moment, we wish to emphasize that we share the Secretary-General's concern for human lives and for the fate of humanitarian relief efforts. It is necessary to explore all possible ways to continue to address the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. We wish to welcome the Secretary-General's readiness to play his part in this important task.

Mr. Monteiro (Portugal): Portugal always hopes that the Security Council will find peaceful solutions to situations of conflict, and it feels no differently in the case of Iraq.

We have always been of the view that full cooperation by Iraq with the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is essential to fulfil the disarmament tasks, to ensure compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and thus enable the Council to lift the sanctions imposed on Iraq. The confirmation by UNSCOM of full cooperation by Iraq, as promised in its letters of 14 November, would have enabled the Council to proceed speedily with a comprehensive review of all disarmament files, as proposed by the Secretary-General. But, after so many efforts and attempts by the Council to bring Iraq to the path of cooperation, the latest report of the Executive Chairman of UNSCOM states that Iraq has not lived up to its commitments and that, in fact, it has not cooperated fully with UNSCOM.

We appreciate the efforts of the Secretary-General to offer for the Council's consideration several possible options to react to the UNSCOM report. Portugal was ready to consider those options, and said so this morning. In the meantime, however, we have been informed of the decision to withdraw all UNSCOM and IAEA personnel from Iraq for reasons of safety. The Executive Chairman of UNSCOM provided further elements on the degree of non-cooperation by Iraq today to Council members.

The Security Council is thus confronted with a declaration by Ambassador Butler that Iraq has not cooperated fully. The United States and the United Kingdom had made it perfectly clear last month that, in the absence of full cooperation by Iraq, they would act without returning to the Council. It is not, therefore, a surprise to my delegation that a decision has been taken to act militarily. Naturally, the Council will have to evaluate the consequences of military action with regard to fulfilling the goals of disarming Iraq and maintaining peace and security in the region.

Portugal deeply regrets that a peaceful solution could not be found. But the main cause of the current crisis is the obstinate policy of Iraq's rulers in refusing to comply with Security Council resolutions. As Chairman of the Committee established under Security Council resolution 661 (1990), I have been particularly sensitive to the consequences of this crisis on the Iraqi people and have sought to do everything possible in the context of the humanitarian programme to alleviate their suffering.

Portugal will continue to try to contribute actively to find ways to minimize the effects of the current circumstances on top of the already difficult living conditions of the Iraqi people. But we must also remember that the primary responsibility for the well-being of all Iraqis falls to the authorities of that country.

Mr. Burleigh (United States of America): Coalition forces today began operations against military targets in Iraq. Our ongoing military action is substantial. We are focusing on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programmes and its ability to threaten its neighbours.

Coalition forces are acting under the authority provided by the resolutions of the Security Council. This action is a necessary and proportionate response to the continued refusal of the Iraqi Government to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and the threat to international peace and security which Iraq's non-compliance represents. In carrying out this action our forces have taken appropriate measures to defend themselves from any interference by Iraq and have made every possible effort to avoid civilian casualties and collateral damage.

As the Council is well aware, this resort to military force was undertaken only when it became evident that diplomacy had been exhausted. The coalition acted out of necessity, and the Government of Iraq bears full responsibility for the consequences of this military operation. We did not act precipitately. On the contrary, the United States has worked with its partners in the Security Council over the past months in a sincere and sustained effort to bring about a peaceful resolution of the confrontation created by Iraq. For reasons best known to Saddam Hussein, Iraq chose to reject that effort.

Following the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi occupation in 1991, Security Council resolution 687 (1991) mandated a ceasefire; but it also imposed a number of essential conditions on Iraq, including the destruction of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and acceptance by Iraq of United Nations inspections.

In its resolutions — including, in addition to resolution 687 (1991), resolutions 707 (1991), 715 (1991), 1154 (1998), 1194 (1998), 1205 (1998) and others — the Council has elaborated and reiterated those conditions, including "full, final and complete disclosure" *(resolution 707 (1991))* of all aspects of its programmes to develop weapons of mass destruction, and "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access" *(ibid.)* for the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) "to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records and means of transportation which they wish to inspect" *(ibid.)*. Iraqi compliance with all these requirements is a fundamental element of international peace and security in the region.

Nevertheless, Iraq has repeatedly taken actions which constitute flagrant, material breaches of these provisions. On a number of occasions the Council has affirmed that similar Iraqi actions constituted such breaches, as well as a threat to international peace and security.

Just one month ago, on 14 November, the Government of Iraq committed to provide full and unconditional cooperation with UNSCOM, as required by the resolutions. The Iraqi Government described it as a "clear and unconditional decision by the Iraqi Government to resume cooperation with UNSCOM and IAEA". Iraq stated that the weapons inspectors could "immediately resume all their activities according to the relevant resolutions of the Security Council". It must be noted that Iraq rescinded its restrictions on the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and offered those assurances only in the face of a credible threat of force. Military force was not employed at that time, however, because the United States, along with other members of the Security Council, sought a peaceful resolution to the situation created by Iraq and opted to go the extra mile to test Iraqi intentions.

In that event, Iraq failed to fulfil its assurances. As the 15 December UNSCOM report makes clear, Iraq failed to provide the full cooperation it promised on 14 November and thus left UNSCOM unable to conduct the substantive disarmament work mandated to it by the Council.

By refusing to make available documents and information requested by UNSCOM within the scope of its mandate, by imposing new restrictions on the weapons inspectors and by repeatedly denying access to facilities which UNSCOM wished to inspect, Iraq once again acted in flagrant and material breach of resolution 687 (1991).

I should like to pause here to praise the outstanding professional work of the talented and dedicated staff of the Special Commission and its Executive Chairman, Richard Butler. Their efforts from 1991 until today have reflected the seriousness with which they view their mandate. Subjected repeatedly to a pattern of harassment from a legion of Iraqi officials, they have always sought to perform their duties in an accurate and serious manner, and they have succeeded.

Iraq fully understood that its actions would be reported accurately to the Security Council by the Special Commission. Indeed, the Iraqi Government did not even wait for the Special Commission's report before presenting its own skewed interpretation of events to the Security Council yesterday, because the Iraqi leadership understood that the report of the Special Commission would be factual.

Following Iraq's repeated, flagrant and material breaches of its obligations under resolutions 687 (1991), 707 (1991), 715 (1991), 1154 (1998), 1194 (1998), 1205 (1998) and others, in addition to its failure to fulfil its own commitments, the coalition today exercised the authority given by Security Council resolution 678 (1990) for Member States to employ all necessary means to secure Iraqi compliance with the Council's resolutions and restore international peace and security in the area. Any Iraqi attempt to attack coalition forces or to initiate aggressive action against a neighbouring State will be met with a swift response by the coalition.

As President Clinton stated this evening, if we had delayed for even a matter of days from Chairman Butler's report, we would have given Saddam Hussein more time to disperse his forces and protect his weapons. Also, the Muslim holy month of Ramadan begins this weekend. For us to initiate military action during Ramadan would be profoundly offensive to the Muslim world and therefore damage our relations with Arab countries and the progress we have made in the Middle East peace process.

President Clinton also stressed that the decision to use force is never cost-free. Whenever American forces are placed in harm's way, we risk the loss of life. And while our strikes are focused on Iraq's military capabilities, there will be unintended Iraqi casualties. Indeed, in the past, Saddam Hussein has intentionally placed Iraqi civilians in harm's way in a cynical bid to sway international opinion.

Secretary Albright emphasized this evening that our quarrel is not with the Iraqi people. On the contrary, we recognize that Iraqis have been the primary victims of Saddam Hussein's failure to cooperate internationally and of his reign of terror domestically. The United States took the lead in establishing a United Nations programme to meet the humanitarian needs of Iraqi civilians and supported the expansion of that programme earlier this year. Secretary Albright stressed that in carrying out military action we will do all we can to minimize civilian casualties, and we will support Iraqis who are working for the day when the people of their country will be free to choose their own leaders and shape their own destiny.

Iraq's policy of unremitting defiance and non-compliance necessitated the resort to military force. The United States did not seek a confrontation and did not undertake this decision lightly. The coalition now looks to the highest level of the Iraqi leadership for an immediate demonstration of unconditional compliance with the terms of the Security Council resolutions.

Mr. Dahlgren (Sweden): It is not difficult to say who is to blame for the crisis between Iraq and the United Nations, a crisis which has been such a large part of the entire workload of the Security Council during the two years that we have sat at this table.

It is the Government of Iraq that again and again has refused to abide by the clear obligations which a unanimous Security Council has decided upon. It is also clear that Iraq has not fulfilled the promise it made to the Secretary-General only a month ago: to cooperate fully and without conditions with the United Nations weapons inspectors.

This has provided a difficult challenge for the Security Council, because the question of Iraqi compliance is indeed a matter for this Council to deal with. We around this table are responsible for ensuring the implementation of the Council's resolutions. We are the ones who should decide the course of action. And I can state tonight, as I have before, that when Iraq seriously violates its obligations, and when all diplomatic means have been exhausted, my Government would even be ready to support a decision in the Council on military action, as a last resort. But that would be a decision for the Security Council.

Now, without such a decision, military action was taken against Iraq a few hours ago. These air strikes were carried out just as the members of the Council were meeting in informal consultations, discussing the latest report from the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) on Iraq's cooperation and also the Secretary-General's letter, which he had sent to us late last night.

The Secretary-General said earlier tonight that this was a sad day for the United Nations and for the world. My Government regrets these air attacks and the consequences they may have for civilians in Iraq. We also regret the fact that the Security Council has been presented with a fait accompli — that we did not even get a chance to conclude our evaluation of the latest developments before military action was a fact. We fear that this will not be of much help in getting the inspections going again, because the Council's overriding aim must remain to rid Iraq of its programmes for developing these awful weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Amorim (Brazil): The Security Council is meeting this evening under the impact of a serious turn of events in the Gulf. Ever since the adoption of resolution 687 (1991) in April 1991, the Council has been grappling with the difficult task of ensuring the Iraqi regime's cooperation with the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the implementation of their mandates. Although Iraqi cooperation has all along been far from satisfactory, UNSCOM and IAEA have performed very valuable work in dispossessing Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction, as widely recognized. It is regrettable that just as the Council was preparing to undertake a comprehensive review of the sanctions regime imposed on Iraq, as suggested by the Secretary-General, the international community was confronted with yet another impasse. Had Iraq demonstrated full cooperation and complied with its obligations under Security Council resolutions and the Memorandum of Understanding, we would not be experiencing the present crisis.

We were informed this afternoon that military action had been decided upon at the very moment when the Security Council was gathered to discuss the report presented by the Executive Chairman of UNSCOM. We had expected to participate in a discussion of the three options suggested by the Secretary-General in his letter. As it turned out, the Security Council did not have the opportunity to reach its own conclusions.

We deplore the fact that circumstances have led to the use of force. Brazil has always favoured dialogue, diplomacy and multilateralism in the articulation of responses to threats to international peace and security. The use of military force should be considered only as an option of last resort. When the use of force is indeed contemplated, this should take place within a multilateral framework. The Security Council remains the sole body with legal authority to mandate actions aimed at enforcing compliance with its own resolutions.

Mr. Konishi (Japan): In line with our Prime Minister's comment which was issued today, I would like the make the following statement.

The letter dated 14 November from the Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq to the Secretary-General raised hopes that Iraq would resume full cooperation with the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The Security Council was looking forward to a comprehensive review of Iraq's compliance with its obligations under all relevant resolutions, which was to be conducted after confirming the resumption of full cooperation by Iraq with UNSCOM and the IAEA. Once full cooperation is resumed, all the obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions can be fulfilled, and the prospect of lifting the sanctions can be made clearer. Japan has long awaited this in order to restore its traditional friendship with the people of Iraq.

However, from the letter of the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission dated 15 December, one has to conclude, regrettably, that Iraq's resumption of cooperation with UNSCOM is not sufficient and that Iraq's behaviour constitutes a serious violation of the relevant Security Council resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), which stipulated the conditions for the ceasefire in 1991, as well as the Memorandum of Understanding signed in February this year by the Secretary-General and the Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq.

Up to now the Security Council and many Member States have worked strenuously to persuade the Government of Iraq to cooperate fully and unconditionally with UNSCOM and the IAEA and have made their utmost diplomatic efforts to ensure Iraq's full compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. Japan, for its part, made numerous démarches to the Government of Iraq and has made various efforts, in cooperation with other States concerned, in the Security Council and elsewhere in order to correct Iraq's behaviour. Regrettably, however, Iraq has failed to provide full cooperation to UNSCOM, leading to the consequences we face today.

In view of the course of events as stated above, Japan supports the action taken by the United States and the United Kingdom.

Japan strongly urges the Government of Iraq to comply immediately and unconditionally with all its obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions. By doing so, Iraq will be able to normalize its relationship with the international community, and international peace and security will be attained at the earliest possible date. Japan sincerely hopes that this will be realized as soon as possible. At the same time, Japan earnestly hopes that the plight of the Iraqi people will be alleviated as soon as possible.

Mr. Jagne (Gambia): It is a pity that things have to be this way. There is, however, no need to cry over spilt milk. The die is cast. This morning, when we looked at the options offered by the Secretary-General following the latest report of the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM), we thought that they constituted a possible way out of the quandary in which we find ourselves — not knowing that it was too late already. It is unfortunate indeed, and very much so, that force had to be used to deal with the situation.

Where do we go from here? Perhaps when the dust has settled, we will be in a better position to see more clearly how best to proceed with normal business. This would depend, of course, on whether there is any business left to do. Whatever the outcome, we would like to see the unity of the Council restored. If it is not, the ability of the vital organ of the United Nations, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, will be seriously impaired.

Having said that, we still believe that Iraq should resume full cooperation with UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency as required under the relevant Security Council resolutions. In this way, the Council can proceed as planned with the comprehensive review. However, we maintain that any comprehensive review must take into account the question of Kuwaiti prisoners of war, archives and other properties removed illegally from Kuwait during the invasion. We are of the firm view that the interests of small States must be protected. This is why we insist so much on this point.

We are also mindful of the plight of the innocent people of Iraq. As far as this issue is concerned, we believe that there is unanimity in the Council to do everything possible to alleviate their suffering.

The people in the region also need peace. They have had so many sleepless nights. The time has now come for them to have some respite.

Mr. Mahugu (Kenya): My delegation is greatly concerned about the current turn of events. It is extremely worrying that while the Council was for the first time discussing the reports submitted to us today by the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) — and it had not concluded its consideration of those reports — a decision to strike Iraq based on the same reports had been taken, and, in fact, the strike seems to have already been under way.

As we have repeatedly said in this Council, any decision to take further action against Iraq remains the sole responsibility of the Security Council. We have maintained that position and ensured that it was reflected in our resolutions. In our statement on 5 November this year, during consideration of resolution 1205 (1998), my delegation stated,

> "that the present draft resolution contains nothing that could open the door in any eventuality for any kind of action without the clear and precise authority of the Security Council. In that respect, we are happy to note that the Security Council, in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution,
>
> > '*Decides*, in accordance with its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, to remain actively seized of the matter.'
>
> "It is, *inter alia*, on the basis of that understanding that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution." *(S/PV.3939, p. 7)*

We regret that the understanding agreed upon then by this Council, and on the basis of which we and many others, on several occasions, joined in a consensus, was not taken into account when the decision to strike Iraq was taken today.

We find it even more difficult to understand the reasons for today's attack, given the contents of the two reports and the letter submitted to the Council today. As the Secretary-General observed in his letter submitting the IAEA and UNSCOM reports,

> "The report from IAEA states that Iraq 'has provided the necessary level of cooperation to enable the above-enumerated activities to be completed efficiently and effectively'. *(S/1998/1172)*

With respect to UNSCOM, the Secretary-General said,

> "The report from UNSCOM includes material that relates to issues prior to 17 November 1998. With regard to the period since then, the report presents a mixed picture and concludes that UNSCOM did not enjoy full cooperation from Iraq." *(ibid.)*

In our reading of the report, this does not in any way indicate that UNSCOM suffered a total lack of cooperation, but, on the contrary, indicates that there was a considerable degree of cooperation extended to it. Given these two positions, of IAEA and UNSCOM, the Secretary-General in his wisdom offered three possible options which, in our view, would have moved the process of disarming Iraq forward.

Any decision taken to force compliance by Iraq with resolutions without the Council's prior authority, in our view, is contrary to the spirit and purpose of those very resolutions, because it also deprived the Council of an opportunity to analyse the reports submitted today and to take a collective decision on them.

It is for these reasons, in line with our declared policy on the non-use of force to resolve international disputes, that we regret today's air strikes against Iraq and call for their immediate cessation and a de-escalation of tension, if the Council is to remain seized of this matter and to continue fulfilling its mandate under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Dejammet (France) (*interpretation from French*): I would like to read a communiqué issued this evening by the French authorities, which is as follows:

> "France deplores the chain of events that led to the American military strikes against Iraq and the

serious human consequences that they may have for the Iraqi population.

"It regrets that the Iraqi leaders were not able to demonstrate the spirit of full cooperation called for by the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding of 23 February 1998 between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and Mr. Tariq Aziz, which would have made possible the comprehensive review of Iraqi disarmament provided for in Security Council resolution 1194 (1998)."

I would like to thank the Secretary-General for the statement that he issued this evening when faced with the facts while the Security Council was holding consultations. We have always supported the Secretary-General's tireless and persistent actions to ensure that the law prevails, despite the obstacles and pitfalls encountered.

The Secretary-General reminds us once again today, a sad day for the United Nations, that the Organization's duty will be to play its role.

Mr. Essonghé (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): In my turn, I would like to express my delegation's regret over the turn that events have taken since this morning, despite the numerous diplomatic efforts that have been made at all levels.

The lengthy crisis that has prevailed between a Member of the United Nations and the Security Council could have been avoided in the light of the initiatives undertaken in February and November this year by the Secretary-General, who is present here, and by the entire membership of the Security Council. Those efforts gave us a glimpse of a possible peaceful resolution of the misunderstandings and lack of understanding on both sides.

Unfortunately, we must conclude that the new state of mind and the hope that emerged on numerous occasions have now been dashed by the events we have learned about today. Nevertheless, we would like to congratulate the Secretary-General on his readiness to contribute to a new effort to produce a peaceful resolution of the question.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 11.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3956

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

Provisional

3956th Meeting

Thursday, 17 December 1998, 3.15 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Buallay	(Bahrain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Amorim
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	Costa Rica	Mr. Niehaus
	France	Mr. Dejammet
	Gabon	Mr. Essonghé
	Gambia	Mr. Jagne
	Japan	Mr. Konishi
	Kenya	Mr. Mahugu
	Portugal	Mr. Soares
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Slovenia	Mr. Türk
	Sweden	Mr. Lidén
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Eldon
	United States of America	Mr. Burleigh

Agenda

The situation concerning Western Sahara

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/1998/1160)

98-86716 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation concerning Western Sahara

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara (S/1998/1160)

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara, document S/1998/1160.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1998/1183, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/1998/1031, letter dated 3 November 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Algeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/1998/1142, letter dated 24 November 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; and S/1998/1169, letter dated 15 December 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Members of the Council have received photocopies of a letter dated 17 December 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, which will be issued as document S/1998/1184.

It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/1998/1183) before it. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Bahrain, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, France, Gabon, Gambia, Japan, Kenya, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1215 (1998).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.35 p.m.

United Nations

S/PV.3957

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

Provisional

3957th Meeting

Friday, 18 December 1998, 9.30 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Buallay . . . . (Bahrain)

Members:	
Brazil	Mr. Amorim
China	Mr. Qin Huasun
Costa Rica	Mr. Niehaus
France	Mr. Doutriaux
Gabon	Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi
Gambia	Mr. Jagne
Japan	Mr. Takasu
Kenya	Mr. Mahugu
Portugal	Mr. Monteiro
Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
Slovenia	Mr. Türk
Sweden	Mr. Dahlgren
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
United States of America	Mr. Burleigh

Agenda

The situation in Sierra Leone

Third progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (S/1998/1176)

98-86722 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 9.55 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Sierra Leone

Third progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (S/1998/1176)

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, and in the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Bernard Miyet, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I invite Mr. Miyet to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the third progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone, document S/1998/1176.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear briefings by Mr. Bernard Miyet, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and by the representative of Sweden, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone.

I now call on the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Bernard Miyet, in order to introduce the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone, contained in document S/1998/1176.

Mr. Miyet (Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great honour for me to set this precedent in the Security Council of being able to speak to members from a seat that is not customarily mine. If possible I shall nonetheless endeavour to provide the Council with the same quality of information as in the past.

The third progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) has just been issued in document S/1998/1176, in accordance with resolution 1181 (1998), which established the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone in July 1998. The report under consideration describes the political, military and security developments in the country since the second progress report was issued on 16 October 1998. It also describes the humanitarian aspects of issues relating to human rights and to the civilian police component of the Mission and submits the Secretary-General's recommendations on future activities for the Mission.

With regard to the military and security situation in the country, in general, as noted in the report, the Government of Sierra Leone has continued to consolidate its political authority during the period under review. The military and security situation, however, continues to be extremely volatile and unpredictable because of the persistent resistance of elements of the former military junta, which are especially active in the east and north of the country. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), and the Civil Defence Forces of Sierra Leone, which are assisting the Government in the restoration of law and order in the country, are currently overstretched and, as the report states, in great need of logistical support.

Since the drafting of the report was completed a few days ago, new developments have taken place at the security level. Elements of the former junta in the north-west of the country have advanced southwards, attacking villages again, killing and mutilating civilians, looting and again destroying property. Thousands of people have been displaced or have fled to the capital, Freetown, for safety. Despite this renewed military activity on the part of elements of the former junta, which repeats a familiar pattern, ECOMOG now states that the rebels have been repulsed and that the roads leading from the capital are now clear. There has also been a rise in tension in other parts of the country owing to rebel activity, especially in the north-east and east.

As the Council is aware, part of the Mission's mandate is to assist the Government to carry out its programme to disarm, demobilize and reintegrate into civil society all Sierra Leonean fighters, including former members of the Republic of Sierra Leone Military Forces who had surrendered to ECOMOG. In view of the uncertain security situation, most of those former soldiers have now been reinducted to fight alongside ECOMOG and the Civil Defence Forces against the rebels.

With regard to the Mission itself, the Security Council authorized the deployment of up to 70 military observers, as well as a medical unit of 15 people. We are endeavouring to bring this about, although it depends on the permanence of the security situation in the country and on the extent to which the Government is able to carry out its disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme. Since the security situation has not improved, and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme has not progressed, only 40 military observers and the medical team have been deployed to date. The military observers are currently based in Freetown, Hastings, Lungi, Bo, Kenema and Makeni, where they are co-deployed with ECOMOG brigades.

The Mission has also deployed five civilian police officers to advise the Government on the restructuring of the Sierra Leonean police force, which was widely discredited because of the links that it had previously established with the junta, and which is suffering from a severe shortage of the resources needed to carry out its task. In this context, the civilian police component of the Mission is working very closely with police officers deployed by the Commonwealth to work with the Government on specific projects.

(*spoke in English*)

I turn to the question of human rights.

In addition to describing the human rights violations committed by the rebels, the human rights section of the Secretary-General's report also describes the treason trials conducted by the Government against civilian and military supporters of the junta now in custody. A total of 96 persons have now been tried in five separate trials in Freetown, of whom 77 have been sentenced to death. On 19 October the Government executed by firing squad 24 military officers who had been condemned to death by a court martial without the right of appeal. All the civilian convicts are now appealing the verdict or sentence, including the leader of the Revolutionary United Front, Corporal Foday Sankoh, who was found guilty of treason by the court on 23 October. On 16 November the Secretary-General wrote to President Kabbah, appealing to him to give every consideration, once the appeals process had been exhausted, to extending mercy to those who had been condemned to death.

The human rights section of the report also describes a number of technical cooperation initiatives undertaken to improve domestic observance of human rights in Sierra Leone. In order to strengthen UNOMSIL's human rights capacity, the Secretary-General is planning to deploy a further five human rights officers to Sierra Leone.

With regard to the humanitarian situation, the efforts of the humanitarian community to maintain access to populations in need, especially in the north and the east, have been disrupted further in the last few days by a spate of rebel attacks near Freetown, which has caused thousands of villagers to flee and has rendered the roads unsafe. There is general insecurity on the roads in all parts of the country. The report estimates that more than 300,000 people have now been displaced within the country since February 1998, an increase of nearly 60,000 since the second progress report. In the wake of recent fighting near Freetown, travel outside the capital for United Nations and humanitarian personnel is now conducted only by air and only to destinations where ECOMOG is present and confirms safety upon arrival.

Yesterday, the 1999 consolidated inter-agency appeal for Sierra Leone was launched in Geneva in the amount of $28 million. The appeal was prepared by United Nations agencies, in consultation with Governments, national and international non-governmental organizations and donors, and comprises 29 projects ranging from immediate life-saving needs to longer-term projects to promote peace and sustainable socio-economic development.

On 30 July 1998, the Secretariat convened a Special Conference on Sierra Leone, in which pledges were made to support the Government and ECOMOG's efforts. The Conference was followed by a meeting of the Contact Group on Sierra Leone in London on 5 November. In Freetown, a Government working group, chaired by the Minister of Finance, Development and Economic Planning, Mr. James Jonah, is following up on the pledges and commitments made in order to ensure speedy disbursement.

Taking all these elements into account, the Secretary-General, as can be seen from the report, is recommending that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNOMSIL by a further six months when its mandate expires on 13 January 1999.

The President *(interpretation from Arabic):* I thank Mr. Miyet for his comprehensive briefing.

I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden, His Excellency, Mr. Hans Dahlgren, who is also Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1132 (1997) concerning Sierra Leone and who will brief the Council on his recent visit to Sierra Leone.

Mr. Dahlgren (Sweden): I am grateful for this opportunity to brief the Security Council about my visit last week to Sierra Leone and Liberia.

I undertook that visit in my capacity as Chairman of the Sierra Leone sanctions Committee, and the Council will recall that, in its follow-up to the Secretary-General's report on Africa, it recommended that those of us who chair sanctions committees ought also to visit the areas we deal with in these committees from time to time for the purpose, of course, of obtaining better information at firsthand, but also to show a presence and to make it clear that we who impose sanctions by adopting resolutions in this Chamber are also actively engaged in their implementation and in making sure that they are enforced.

So my primary assignment during that visit was to study the implementation of the sanctions that are currently in place against the rebel forces in Sierra Leone. These, as members know, include an arms embargo on the non-governmental forces, as well as a travel ban for the members of the military junta. Yesterday we had an informal meeting of the sanctions Committee to talk about some conclusions, in some detail. But, of course, I also came back with some general impressions regarding the crisis in that country, about which I would like to say a few words today.

It has been said that one of the first victims of war is the truth. And it may be important to mention at the outset that the absence of accurate and verifiable information in a civil war situation such as the one in Sierra Leone should serve as a warning not to rush to conclusions. Absolute facts are hard to come by — in particular regarding violations of sanctions — but one thing is indisputable, and obvious even to a visitor who stays there for less than a week: the situation in Sierra Leone is tense, and as we heard from Under-Secretary-General Miyet, it has not got any better lately.

Although Freetown is liberated together with other parts of the country, Sierra Leone is still plagued by a civil war and the rebels have proved to be a very tough target. Their activities, which we all know bring immense human suffering in their wake, are both highly mobile and unpredictable: defeated in one part of the country, they have been able to remobilize and to increase their terror in other parts. Right now, we understand there is intense rebel activity in the north-western part of the country, and that has raised tensions in the capital even further. Of course, this has made it difficult for the people of Sierra Leone to return fully to normal life. This applies, above all, to the more than half a million people who are internally displaced persons or refugees in other countries.

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) is generally seen to be doing a good job at promoting stability and helping extend safety to the people of Sierra Leone. However, logistical restraints do remain, and during our talks with the Force Commanders, we were asked directly to transmit requests for stronger international support.

The acts of terror committed against civilians by the rebels in Sierra Leone are absolutely horrendous. It is hard to find words strong enough to describe these atrocities; they even use mutilation to spread their terror, simply cutting off parts of the body of their victims with large knives. They cut off arms and legs, even noses and ears. They burn men, women and children alive. According to the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) more than 4,000 people have been either summarily executed or mutilated since April this year. Pictures of maimed children are now circulating in world media, and when one has learned about these gruesome acts at first hand, it is not hard to understand the strong calls for an international criminal court that are arising out of this situation.

The humanitarian situation is also serious, and of particular concern, as Under-Secretary-General Miyet emphasized, is the fact that parts of the country remain out of reach for humanitarian organizations, and therefore we do not know the full scope of the tragic situation. We did hear some complaints about ECOMOG and the Civil Defence Forces (CDF) sometimes having made humanitarian access difficult. I therefore found reason during my visit to share with the relevant actors, in my national capacity, our view of the importance of showing respect for humanitarian law and of reaching out to civilians in a crisis such as this.

Of particular concern when looking into this conflict is the extreme burden carried by the children of Sierra Leone. They have become victims on both sides, and we know that, unfortunately, this is not a new problem in this region. Many of these young children were abducted long ago into the ranks of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), and they are now — some of them perhaps at the age of only eight or ten — some of the fiercest fighters in the war. Of course, they are heavily traumatized, fed violence and destruction for a large part of their lives, and I think one of the biggest challenges ahead will be to integrate the surviving children of Sierra Leone into a society where identity is based on respect and common norms, and not on carrying a loaded rifle. These children should be able to go to school and to play with their friends. They should be able to be with their families and not grow up with fighters as their role models. I would like to plead, in the strongest possible terms, that special attention be given to the situation of the children of Sierra Leone in the international support provided for the reconstruction of the country. And I think it is proper, also for the sake of the children, to plead with the Government of Sierra Leone to continue to make very serious efforts at national reconciliation. That is the only way to provide a sound and secure future for the country — and the children are our future.

It is hard to see that any military solution to the conflict can provide a lasting peace in Sierra Leone. In that context, it is also difficult to find viable alternatives to initiating a dialogue. Attempts to reach out towards a peaceful solution are now being made by the Government, and I strongly believe that this should be encouraged and that no effort ought to be spared to get the rebels to lay down their arms and surrender.

As we have seen in the report of the Secretary-General, there is quite a discussion in Sierra Leone these days about executions: those that took place earlier this fall and a number of further death sentences that have been handed down and which have all been appealed. Speaking not for the sanctions Committee but in my capacity as Sweden's representative to the United Nations, I pleaded with the authorities in Sierra Leone, including the President, not to make further use of the death penalty — for reasons of principle to us, but also for the sake of succeeding in the reconciliation efforts. It is my feeling that there is a readiness to attempt to heed such pleas, even if that is by no means assured in each individual case.

When speaking about the issue of the war in Sierra Leone, I would also like to emphasize the importance of the regional approach. The relation between Sierra Leone and Liberia is, of course, particularly relevant. Important steps towards the building of renewed confidence have been taken by the Secretary-General, and these are now being vigorously pursued by both Mr. Okelo and Mr. Downes-Thomas, as the Representatives of the Secretary-General in the two countries. I would also like to mention the efforts of the United States and of the Reverend Jesse Jackson to try to reinvigorate the Mano River Union; we feel that these are bearing encouraging results as well. Both President Kabbah in Sierra Leone and President Taylor in Liberia expressed to us their commitment to pursue the track of bilateral cooperation.

Let me conclude these general observations by commending the very efficient and important work carried out by UNOMSIL. I believe that that mission is an excellent example of how a relatively small United Nations presence, with the right mix of components, can play a very significant role. That goes for the military observers, but also for a very dedicated team of human rights staff as well as for the civilian police element.

Turning now to the question of sanctions, of course it is obvious that these are not fully implemented. We heard many reports of arms and ammunition getting through to the rebels from outside Sierra Leone. Although some of the resupplies seem to come from looting and attacks within the country itself, arms and ammunition are reportedly also coming in from the outside, and that is obviously in contravention of the mandatory Security Council resolution.

The land borders of Sierra Leone with both Guinea and Liberia are very porous and difficult to monitor. But there is a strong perception in Sierra Leone that outside support of this kind is indeed coming in from Liberia. No tangible evidence was presented to us, and the quantities of the reported deliveries are difficult to assess. Some of our interlocutors referred to this as a trickle of arms. Others — and I want to mention in particular the ECOMOG commanders, but also some foreign observers in Freetown — claim that more substantial deliveries have been reported, including by truck and by helicopter.

The President of Liberia, Mr. Charles Taylor, with whom I had the opportunity to raise these issues, said that he could not dispute that some, though less significant, trafficking of arms did indeed come through Liberia, but he also stated clearly that his Government was not involved in this. He also denied reports that we had heard, that rebel leaders had been allowed to travel freely into his country. When we were there, President Taylor reiterated the proposal he had previously made to the President of Sierra Leone on setting up a system of joint border controls with that country.

From our talks with President Kabbah in Freetown, we understood that this is a proposal that is seen as a good starting point also in Sierra Leone. I too believe that it could be very useful if the United Nations together with the international community were to consider supporting such joint operations. Such support could include technical equipment, but also actual border monitors or observers; this would serve as an important confidence-building measure, provided that the necessary security assurances could be obtained, and also as a way of safeguarding the Security Council sanctions.

At the same time, I would like to reiterate a point which I made several times during the visit: that in the end it rests upon each and every State to do its utmost to ensure respect for United Nations sanctions. That cannot be taken over by anyone else.

There are surely those individuals who make a good living out of the arms trade in West Africa, where, as is well known, diamonds are a handsome reward in return. To my mind, there is, of course, no excuse for such behaviour. Nor is there any excuse for sustaining the war in Sierra Leone by supporting the rebels with arms.

The sanctions committee for Sierra Leone discussed these matters in detail yesterday, and when it delivers its formal report later this month, I believe it might include some observations that will be useful to build on in the future work of the Committee and of the Council itself in relation to this matter. This concerns the arms embargo, but also enforcement of the travel restrictions. As members will have gathered from what I have said, it is my hope that the sanctions Committee will continue to involve itself actively in doing its part to promote peace in Sierra Leone.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Sweden for his most insightful statement, which reflected his full knowledge of the situation in Sierra Leone. He spoke of the civil war in that country and of its implications in terms of the problems faced by the people of Sierra Leone, especially children — a matter which makes it particularly urgent that we tackle the security situation there, along with the problem of refugees and displaced persons, by putting in place an effective humanitarian assistance programme and endeavouring to find a peaceful resolution of the situation. I thank him also for highlighting the linkage between the situations in Sierra Leone and in Liberia.

Mr. Doutriaux (France) (*interpretation from French*): I thank Mr. Bernard Miyet for briefing the Council on the situation in Sierra Leone on behalf of the Secretary-General. I also thank Ambassador Dahlgren for briefing us following his visit to the region, *inter alia* in his capacity as Chairman of the sanctions Committee on Sierra Leone.

We note from those briefings that considerable and serious difficulties remain, with an impact on the humanitarian situation of the population. Human rights violations persist, and executions have taken place; we have condemned these. In the military sphere, as Mr. Miyet has noted, attacks by rebel forces continue.

But when we read the report of the Secretary-General, we note that there have been some encouraging developments — particularly the recent summit that brought together President Kabbah of Sierra Leone, President Taylor of Liberia and President Conte of Guinea — which make it possible to envisage rapprochement among those three countries. It is clear that the internal situation in Sierra Leone depends also on what takes place on the regional level, so we should support anything that can be done to promote rapprochement among the three leaders and among their countries. Let me note in passing that those three presidents, along with many other African leaders, participated in the Franco-African Summit held at Paris a few weeks ago.

On the internal level, there is clearly only one solution: dialogue. Of course, the prerequisite for such dialogue is a cessation of hostilities by the rebels. Let us acknowledge that in Sierra Leone, as in many other countries in Africa where there is civil war, hostilities must cease and dialogue must be promoted between the Government and those contesting its authority.

The solution should also include support for regional initiatives, namely, for the work and actions of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and its Monitoring Group (ECOMOG). This is what we are doing in our resolutions and also what some donor countries supporting ECOMOG are doing. France is also providing its support through bilateral assistance to support the Guinea-Conakry contingent participating in ECOMOG activities in Sierra Leone.

Finally, allow me also to refer to what the Chairman of the sanctions Committee on Sierra Leone has said. We must continue to question ourselves about the effectiveness of our policy of embargo on the supply of arms to rebels in Sierra Leone. We must ask ourselves about its effectiveness and whether it should perhaps be strengthened to promote an abatement of tension and an end to conflict in Sierra Leone.

I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on an item that remains a matter of concern despite some encouraging signs.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of France for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Mahugu (Kenya): Allow me first to thank you, Mr. President, for arranging this meeting in an open setting. As has been said by the representative of France, we believe that this can only enhance transparency and hopefully increase the Council's effectiveness.

My delegation would like to thank Under-Secretary-General Miyet for his introduction of the report of the Secretary-General and, indeed, for his update. We would also like to thank Ambassador Dahlgren of Sweden for the excellent report on his recent visit to Sierra Leone as the Chairman of the Sierra Leone Security Council sanctions Committee, which has nourished our understanding of the actual situation on the ground.

I myself recall my visit earlier this year to Angola in my capacity as the Chairman of the Angola Security Council sanctions Committee. I must say that I found that visit to be important and indeed necessary, not only for myself, but as something that should be done by all chairmen of Security Council sanctions committees. I am therefore very happy to note that Ambassador Dahlgren did visit Sierra Leone, and I hope that in the future other chairmen of the Council's sanctions committees will be able to visit their respective areas.

Because of the unending nature of the conflict in Sierra Leone and the immense costs to the civilian population, the dual- track approach as envisaged, combining both military and diplomatic elements, is a most pragmatic venture that my delegation wholeheartedly supports. However, for this to succeed we need the full support not only of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL), but also of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). In this regard, we appreciate the Gambia's emerging efforts to broker a peace deal with the rebels.

Sierra Leone's relations with its neighbours clearly also needs to be nourished. Ambassador Dahlgren also referred to this point in his briefing. This is why my delegation encourages more frequent meetings of the Mano River Union, as he has said. Indeed, in previous Council meetings, my delegation has suggested that such summit-level meetings could be augmented by a more regular permanent senior officials meeting to deal with petty problems and establish relations that would enhance confidence-building measures. This sort of arrangement has worked quite well in our region of East Africa, and we encourage the parties in Sierra Leone to look at it closely.

It is because of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) that the constitutionally elected Government was re-installed in Sierra Leone. We must all support ECOMOG's efforts on the military side through logistical support and forces. This would strengthen our negotiating voice in the dual-track approach currently envisioned.

In brief, because of the reasons that I have advanced, Kenya supports the Secretary-General's recommendation to extend the mandate of UNOMSIL, upon its expiration in January of next year, for a further six months, to July 1999.

The United Nations, we believe, has done a very good job in Sierra Leone under the very able leadership of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Okelo, and the men and women of UNOMSIL. They deserve our full support.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Kenya for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Niehaus (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to thank Ambassador Dahlgren and Under-Secretary-General Miyet for the very timely and important information they have given us on Sierra Leone. We would also like to thank you, Mr. President, for taking the wise decision of continuing this practice of open briefings, which is essential for the transparency of the work of the Council and which we believe should be followed in the future.

During his visit to the United Nations a few months ago, President Kabbah said that he was giving particular attention to the idea of demilitarizing the country and putting it under civil control. Costa Rica understands that the security situation in Sierra Leone is very complex as a result of the activities of the rebels who carried out the *coup d'état*. We also understand that, in the light of these circumstances, it may be very difficult and perhaps even untimely for the Government to take concrete steps to move in that direction.

Our own national experience has shown us and convinced us of the opportunities presented for small, developing countries by the demilitarization of society. This is why we would like to draw attention to this issue and express our hope that Sierra Leone will be able to make progress towards that goal in the future.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Costa Rica for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Takasu (Japan): I would like to join the previous speakers in expressing my delegation's appreciation to Under-Secretary-General Miyet for his update of the situation in Sierra Leone. We are also grateful to Ambassador Dahlgren, who made a second trip to Sierra Leone as the Chairman of the sanctions Committee. His first-hand briefing this morning was very informative and extremely useful. I would like to join Ambassador Mahugu in his earlier comment that the visits of chairmen of sanctions committees to the relevant countries can be very useful in giving us first-hand briefings to form the basis of our valuable discussions.

My delegation would also like to commend the role of the United Nations in Sierra Leone, the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Okelo, and the members of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL), together with the invaluable role being played there by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), to bring peace and security to that country.

According to this morning's briefing, it is very clear that the current military and security situation is very worrisome. We are particularly concerned about the immense humanitarian suffering caused by the rebels' continuing attacks on civilians and about the plight of children. Reports of children being forced into combat continue.

On the other hand, the report of the Secretary-General gives us some encouraging signs. For instance, we are encouraged by the effort made by the Government of Sierra Leone towards national reconciliation and by certain progress made in the demobilization and integration of former combatants. We also welcome the Government's recent commitment not to involve combatants under the age of 18.

For reasons of time, I would like to raise only one issue this morning, namely, the question of how effective the sanctions regime has been and how to strengthen it. Ambassador Dahlgren came back with the news about the concept of joint patrols on the common border with Liberia, which is a very important subject. I wish to refer not only to the effectiveness of the sanctions regime, but also to subregional approaches aimed at producing confidence-building measures between the neighbouring countries. I would appreciate it if either Ambassador Dahlgren or Under-Secretary-General Miyet could comment on a few of these issues at the end of this round of discussions. Indeed, the Secretary-General's report talks about this concept in several paragraphs.

There are several concepts here. One is the joint patrolling of the two countries' common border by the Sierra Leonean Government force and the Liberian force. The other is to do this internationally, for instance through or with the assistance of ECOMOG.

My question here concerns the role of the United Nations. Paragraph 6 of the report of the Secretary-General notes that Ambassador Dahlgren was approached by local authorities requesting that United Nations military observers be deployed in assisting ECOMOG in patrolling the frontier. Another paragraph touches on the question of cooperation between the two countries in joint border patrols.

This is perhaps a major issue, and I should like some more information about the role of military observers. While I appreciate, for instance, support in terms of technical equipment, as mentioned by Ambassador Dahlgren, with respect to the deployment of military observers along the border and greater involvement in joint patrols, my first question would be, is this viable? Obviously, this is not part of UNOMSIL's mandate at this time, and the current authorized level of UNOMSIL does not allow it. Again, I would ask if these proposals are viable, and if it is worthwhile pursuing the expansion of UNOMSIL's mandate and strength, if necessary.

Mr. Amorim (Brazil): Mr. President, let me also say, as previous speakers have done, that I very much appreciate the fact that you have organized this open briefing. I hope that this practice will become common in the future, as it is a very useful one for the work of the Security Council and for the benefit of the membership at large. I wish also to thank Mr. Miyet for his enlightening briefing on the situation in Sierra Leone and to express my gratitude to Ambassador Dalhgren for his leadership in chairing the sanctions Committee on Sierra Leone and for the very useful information he shared with us after his trip to that country.

I do not wish to comment at length on the contents of these reports. I am sure that we will have the opportunity to discuss them next month. Of course, it is a very discouraging picture, one which includes mutilations and the use of children in armed conflict. I would also agree with what Ambassador Dahlgren said to the authorities in Sierra Leone in his national capacity about the death penalty. I do not think that is the best way to promote reconciliation.

I would like also to avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute once again to Ambassador Dahlgren for the way he conducted the work of the Committee. I think it is an appropriate time to do so, because Sweden's term in the Security Council is coming to a close. Through him, I wish also to pay tribute to the chairmen of the other sanctions Committees who are leaving the Council at the end of December, especially for the leadership they collectively exercised in pushing us — the other chairmen of sanctions Committees who are staying on the Council for another year — to present a paper on sanctions.

I think what Ambassador Dahlgren said today illustrates very clearly the need for an in-depth discussion on sanctions, and I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the five permanent representatives, including Ambassador Dahlgren, who were very active in that field.

I believe also that sooner rather than later we should have an open discussion in this Chamber on the question of sanctions. I think it was very clear from what Ambassador Dahlgren said not only in relation to Sierra Leone but also in his allusions to other situations — and I interpreted one of them as referring to Angola — that a discussion of sanctions as an instrument of the Security Council is very important. Normally when these questions are raised, there is always some preoccupation or concern that a discussion on sanctions would be only an opportunity to attack sanctions regimes. I do not think that is so. Of course, one may have doubts about some sanctions regimes or about the humanitarian consequences in some cases, and it is legitimate that a discussion on that should also take place, as it did in the General Assembly.

But I believe that the most important aspect is that sanctions often are an instrument of peace if they are well implemented. If we look into the situation of some other countries in the reports that we have had in the press, not only about the sale of diamonds but also about the purchase of armaments and so on, we can see the importance of the use of this instrument as probably very often the only way to maintain peace in a given country or a given situation.

I wish therefore once again to commend your initiative, Mr. President, of keeping up this practice of holding open briefings, and to express my gratitude to all the chairmen of sanctions committees, who are now, let us say, represented by Ambassador Dahlgren, and to thank him for the presentation he has just made.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I subscribe to the hope expressed by Brazil that these plenary open meetings will be held more frequently in the interest of all.

Mr. Burleigh (United States of America): I too, like my colleagues, would like to thank Under-Secretary-General Miyet for his briefing and his update on the report. I should like especially to recognize Ambassador Dahlgren and his contribution, both in his role as Chairman of the sanctions Committee for the past difficult period and for this initiative he has taken, the results of which we have learned about today — that is, the indispensable personal observations and assessments he has made about the situation in Sierra Leone. I agree with Ambassador Amorim that the situation on the ground there is very discouraging.

I want to thank Ambassador Dahlgren for his mention of the role that our presidential Special Envoy, Reverend Jesse Jackson, is trying to play in facilitating the reconciliation between the countries in question. He was here this week and was able to brief Council colleagues about his activities, and we will continue to keep Council members informed of his efforts.

I have two specific questions, because, as has been noted, we will go into more detail later when we talk about the renewal of the mandate. But I wanted to ask, on this joint border-monitoring mechanism proposal between Liberia and Sierra Leone, if either Ambassador Dahlgren or Under-Secretary-General Miyet would like to address what practical next steps there may be or what role we might play in trying to help this process along — "we" meaning the Council or the Secretariat.

Secondly, for Under-Secretary-General Miyet, I have a question about the force protection of the United Nations personnel deployed there, and whether he believes that arrangements are still adequate for their protection or whether some consideration is still being given to any redeployment of the personnel of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL).

Mr. Monteiro (Portugal): My delegation also is very happy with the format of this meeting, and I praise you, Mr. President, for organizing it. Naturally I would recall that this is one of the guidelines that we have already adopted in the Council, and I believe that this practice will continue in future. The fact that other States Members of the Organization are participating here or listening to us constitutes an incentive to go ahead with this decision already taken by the Security Council.

I am pleased also to see Under-Secretary-General Miyet at this meeting. As he told us in the beginning of his intervention, he also is pleased to be here, and we welcome his presence at this open briefing. The Council has benefited a lot from the briefings of Mr. Miyet, and this is a good opportunity for other States to listen to him.

Ambassador Dahlgren is also creating a precedent here, as was already underlined by my colleagues. I would like to underline it as well. It is very important that we are having this open meeting because it underlines the more active role we want the sanctions committees and their Chairpersons to play.

We are debating these proposals in the Security Council, and I very much hope we will take decisions by the end of this month — we are in your hands, Mr. President, until the end of this month — to adopt some guidelines on the questions relating to the debate on sanctions referred to by Ambassador Amorim. The most important point is the role of the Chairpersons of the sanctions committees.

As Ambassador Dahlgren said here, it is not only important that the Chairpersons can get better information during their visits to the region or countries targeted, by the sanctions; it is not only gathering better information that is important, and afterwards coming here and sharing this information as Ambassador Dahlgren did with us this morning — the other point that he made regarding the implementation of sanctions is also very important. This is absolutely essential. We are going on and on, and it is clear that we have to address this question of arms embargoes in a different way. Because if not, they are ineffective, and the Council sometimes seems to be collaborating passively with situations that are totally unacceptable.

We can do this only in an open way. We can do this only with the participation of all the Member States of the Organization. It is not only the Security Council that can do this. This is a responsibility of the whole Organization. For the Organization to be responsible, naturally it is important for the Security Council to provide information and to share these elements and this work with the general membership. It is important to reveal to the general membership more of the work of the sanctions committees and the work we do in these committees.

Regarding the situation in Sierra Leone, I would like very much again to address and thank Ambassador Dahlgren for the very good briefing, in addition to the excellent report that we have from the Secretary-General. Given the time limits, I would just underline two points regarding the information that was shared with us. First of all, Ambassador Dahlgren provides a very vivid picture of how appalling the human rights situation in Sierra Leone is. One point he made is very important. It is important that it be clear that those who are committing these crimes will not be able to do so with impunity. That is why it so important that the International Criminal Court was created this year in Rome. This is very important, because it is absolutely essential to avoid impunity in future situations, as well as in the ones we are facing now.

At the same, this calls our attention to another point. In many of these conflicts there can be no military solutions. We have to have, in the end, dialogue and national reconciliation. National reconciliation is an important factor in which, again, human rights play an important role — the guarantee of individuals' rights. That is why the appeal of the Secretary-General to President Kabbah on the questions of executions and the death penalty is, in my opinion, so important.

Naturally, I would like to praise again what Ambassador Dahlgren said about the situation of children. This is an important aspect, and this is why, too, it is so important for the whole Organization to support the role of Ambassador Olara Otunnu. Olara Otunnu is now dealing with the situation of children in armed conflicts, and we have to give him all possible support, and we have to praise the Secretary-General for creating this important function at the United Nations.

Once again I would like to praise the work of Ambassador Dahlgren and the initiative that he himself took, not only this second time. He visited the region twice: the first time in his national capacity, and this time as Chairman of the sanctions Committee. I would like very much to praise him for this.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I appreciate the words of encouragement from the representative of Portugal.

Mr. Türk (Slovenia): I would like to join the preceding speakers in expressing our appreciation to you, Mr. President, for having organized the briefing and the discussion today in the present format. My remarks will be brief since time is precious.

I would like to say, first of all, that we are grateful to the Secretary-General for the comprehensive report and to Mr. Miyet, the Under-Secretary-General, for the introduction. We studied the report, which details the military and security situation and the political aspects of the situation, and we can certainly say that, like others, we value very highly the role of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL), and we support the expansion of its mandate. Moreover, the important feature of the report — namely, the one related to human rights — is something that deserves our full support, and we hope that, during the detailed discussion that the Council will have at a later stage, we will be able to speak about these issues in some more detail.

Today, however, I would like to limit my remarks to some of the points made by Ambassador Dahlgren, who visited the country recently. I would like, as others have, to thank Ambassador Dahlgren for his presentation and join in the opinion voiced by Ambassador Amorim a short while ago when he characterized Ambassador Dahlgren's mission as an embodiment of the wishes and aspirations of many members of the Security Council. I think that his presentation today provided useful insight into the situation.

The practice of the Chairmen of sanctions committees visiting the target countries or areas is very valuable. We believe that it requires more careful consideration. The experiences gained in this context should be given proper consideration. This practice is still at an early stage. I think that we are beyond the experimental stage, but not at the stage where the practice is fully established and applicable to all the sanctions committees. So I think that some further reflection is necessary.

We understand that the sanctions Committee has discussed some of the detailed issues relating to the operation of sanctions. I would like to mention just one point in this connection. Ambassador Dahlgren rightly emphasized the importance of cooperation by all States in the proper implementation of the sanctions regime. I think that this is a very valid point, a central point in the operation of the sanctions regime under resolution 1132 (1997), and I think that this basic point relates to all sanctions regimes currently in place. I think the Security Council should give proper consideration to the issue of the implementation of sanctions later on, when the discussion on the working paper by the Chairpersons of the sanctions committees — which was referred to earlier in the debate today — is taken up again by the Security Council.

Finally, a few points on the political situation in Sierra Leone in general. Again I would like to thank Ambassador Dahlgren for providing us with very valuable insights. He spoke about a very tense situation, about the widespread guerilla warfare and about problems that are very serious and to which solutions will not be easy to find.

I would like to recall in this connection that the Security Council has always insisted on a peaceful resolution of the conflict. I would just like to quote from paragraph 3 of resolution 1132 (1997) — the basic resolution on this issue, adopted by the Security Council on 8 October 1997. In the specific context of that time, that resolution insisted on support "for the peaceful restoration of the constitutional order" in the country.

Nothing that has happened subsequent to the adoption of that resolution has changed that fundamental insistence of the Security Council and the fundamental principle of the Security Council's approach. Therefore, we very strongly support all the efforts mentioned by Ambassador Dahlgren to seek a peaceful solution.

I would like to mention that we certainly support the efforts by Reverend Jackson and by the leaders in the region, and, above all, we support the efforts of the International Contact Group on Sierra Leone, which met in London on 5 November. We would like to encourage the continuation of those efforts.

Now, international efforts in themselves will not be enough and the true path to a solution is national reconciliation in the country. Many who have spoken before me emphasized in this context the importance of the fate of children and we certainly associate ourselves with all their points.

We would like to add only one additional point. The executions which have taken place in the recent past require critical consideration by the Security Council. We do not think that executions lead to national reconciliation and this has to be given proper attention, especially in light of future developments, including the fate of Foday Sankoh, which may be an issue to be kept in mind by the Security Council's members.

In conclusion, I would like to say once again that we shall come back to the situation in a more detailed way when the Council takes up the report. But at this stage I would like to conclude by saying that the present format of briefing and consideration of these issues by the Security Council is very useful.

Mr. Moungara Moussotsi (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): I, too, wish to thank the Secretariat, in particular Mr. Miyet, for the very extensive report that, as always, has been submitted to us. We are also grateful to Ambassador Dahlgren of Sweden for his initiative in visiting Sierra Leone and Liberia in his capacity as Chairman of the Sierra Leone sanctions Committee. He did so in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Council, in particular resolution 1196 (1998) on this subject.

We are encouraged by certain positive signs, such as the implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone and the efforts of the Government and the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG).

However, we are obliged to note that concerns persist, in particular about barbaric activities undertaken by the rebels. My delegation was especially shocked by the information we have just received concerning the mutilation, execution and burning of women, children and other civilians. We believe that ECOMOG should be supported by the international community in its efforts to assist the Government of Sierra Leone in coping with the rebels. We believe, like other delegations, that the execution of members of the former military junta does not contribute to dialogue. We favour their being granted amnesty, which would promote national reconciliation in Sierra Leone.

We are also concerned by the significant trade in weapons, which reinforces my delegation's conviction that only a joint campaign against the illegal arms trade can resolve this problem. We welcome the recent summit of heads of State of members of the Mano River Union and encourage them to help Sierra Leone pursue, in the light of its experience, its campaign against illicit arms trafficking. We believe that there is a need for the involvement not only of the United Nations and the Security Council, but also, as some Ambassadors here have already said, of the entire international community and all States Members of the United Nations, in a sustained and coordinated effort against the illicit trade in weapons.

My delegation reserves the right to return to the report and its content in the impending debate.

Mr. Jagne (Gambia): My delegation is grateful to Ambassador Dahlgren and, through him, to the Government of Sweden for the keen interest that they have always shown in Sierra Leone. Ambassador Dahlgren's recent trip to that country is a clear testimony to his commitment as Chairman of the Sierra Leone sanctions Committee. The importance of such visits cannot be overemphasized. We also thank the Secretary-General for his report and Mr. Miyet for his update.

Whilst noting with satisfaction that the Sierra Leonean Government is consolidating its authority, we deplore the fact that the military situation is still volatile and unpredictable, due likely to rebel activity, killing and mutilating of civilians. Ambassador Dahlgren has given us a graphic illustration of these atrocities.

Only the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) has the ability to deal with the rebels and to help restore stability to Sierra Leone. This is why my delegation has been calling for increased assistance to ECOMOG. Furthermore, the impact of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) will be felt better only when ECOMOG is given the logistics and material support that it requires. ECOMOG and UNOMSIL have mutually reinforcing roles. They complement each other, but if one of the parties is lacking adequate resources, their overall performance will not be satisfactory.

Only a few days ago, we began an open debate on post-conflict peace-building, but we all know that, without the necessary resources, there can be no meaningful peace-building. This is why the international community should disburse, as quickly as possible -- as indicated by Mr. Miyet — the pledges and commitments made during the special conference on Sierra Leone. We cannot see how, without the adequate resources, the Government's programme of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration could be carried forward, especially the component affecting women and children.

With regard to the question of human rights, we have no doubt that a successful rehabilitation programme, within the wider context of post-conflict peace-building, could also take care of human rights concerns. Post-conflict peace-building efforts should be concentrated on development-oriented projects for self-employment. Creating attractive outlets for ex-combatants and even rebels would encourage them to lay down their arms and participate in the uphill task of nation-building.

So much for the internal situation. From a regional perspective, as the representative of France rightly pointed out, subregional and regional cooperation is also important in the search for peace. The Mano River Union summit is a case in point. President Kabbah paid an official visit to the Gambia recently. Such high-level exchanges of visits contribute to confidence-building and should be encouraged.

Finally, we support the Secretary-General's recommendation for the extension of the mandate of UNOMSIL for another six-month period. We also salute the role of Reverend Jackson in the region and we thank you, Sir, for organizing this open meeting, which we find very useful.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): Thank you, Sir, for your initiative this morning. I warmly endorse the remarks of colleagues about the relevance of doing what we are doing this morning in an open meeting, and we must do more of them.

I should like to thank Under-Secretary-General Miyet for his briefing of us this morning. He made some important points about how we take forward our work on Sierra Leone and these are points which we must follow up and produce action on in our discussions to come. The United Kingdom will contribute substantially to those discussions.

I particularly wanted to join colleagues in paying tribute to the skill and dedication that Ambassador Dahlgren has brought to his work as Chairman of the Sierra Leone sanctions Committee and to his initiative in undertaking his visit and reporting to us. His first-hand experience is particularly valuable in this instance. My delegation strongly supports the points that he has made, not only about the implementation of sanctions, but also, in his capacity as Permanent Representative of Sweden, about the situation in Sierra Leone itself.

The United Kingdom has a very strong continuing interest in that situation and in remedying it. We, over the past few months in particular, have called a number of special meetings, meetings of contact groups and other gatherings of interested members of the international community, together with the United Nations. We have put an increasing amount of our own resources into the situation, and we are going to continue with follow-up work on this situation to represent, as best we can, the strong interest of the international community in making things in Sierra Leone better. But we are particularly concerned about the way things are developing in that country, and especially the continuing rebel activity.

The people of Sierra Leone do have to be protected from what is really a campaign of murder, terror and horrific abuse of human rights. In these circumstances, the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) is doing excellent work, but there is a particular and an urgent need for the international community to give greater support to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), in particular to enable further troops to be sent there to join those troops already in the field. And we hope that more donor countries will come forward to join in this activity.

It is an example, as we have already begun to discuss in our debate on peace-building and post-conflict work, of how easy it is to think that a situation in a country is being improved, but we have not done quite enough to sustain that improvement. It is time, I think, to draw conclusions from the difficulties that Sierra Leone is now confronting — we have to ensure that what we believe is a post-conflict situation does not dissolve back into a real and nasty new outbreak of that conflict. So, I appeal to colleagues and to the membership of the Organization generally to take account of the briefings that we have had this morning to look again to see whether they can contribute to the work that needs to be done in Sierra Leone.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We wish to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting today, which, in our view, will be very helpful in enhancing the transparency of the Security Council's work. We wish to thank the Secretary-General for his report and Under-Secretary-General Miyet for his briefing. We also wish to thank Ambassador Dahlgren of Sweden for his briefing on his visit to Sierra Leone. Based on information given to us by our embassy in Sierra Leone, the Swedish Ambassador's visit to Freetown, Sierra Leone, elicited considerable favourable response.

The Chinese delegation agrees generally with the Secretary-General's analysis of the situation in Sierra Leone. We commend the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) and the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) for their roles in stabilizing the situation in Sierra Leone. We also commend and support the Sierra Leone Government for adopting the dual-track approach for the smooth achievement of national reconciliation.

China is deeply disturbed by continuing reports that large amounts of arms have been flowing illegally from Liberia into rebels hands in Sierra Leone. The Security Council should attach great importance to this, since it not only violates the provisions of the relevant Security Council resolutions, but has also caused harm to large numbers of innocent civilians. We propose that the Security Council sanction Committees on Sierra Leone and Liberia carry out the necessary investigation and propose measures for improving the effectiveness of the implementation of the arms embargo. We hope that these two sanctions Committees can strengthen their coordination and exchanges in order to strengthen the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

China supports the Secretary-General's recommendation for the extension of UNOMSIL's mandate for six months. We hope that when security conditions permit, the second group of military observers can be dispatched as soon as possible. In connection with the recommendation on expanding UNOMSIL's civilian staff, we propose that the views of the Sierra Leone Government be sought.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of China for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Granovsky (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): We are grateful to Under-Secretary-General Bernard Miyet and to Ambassador Dahlgren for their substantive briefings on the situation in Sierra Leone.

The Russian Federation supports the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report, in particular his proposal for the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) for six months. We are satisfied that the Government of Sierra Leone is undertaking consistent steps in the search for a political solution to the problems. An example of such efforts is the conduct of a consultative campaign to draw up consensus proposals on major policy issues, including national reconciliation.

In view of all this Government activity, the unceasing activity of the rebels, who are guilty of many attacks on the civilian population, appears all the more horrendous. Thanks to the joint efforts of the Sierra Leone authorities and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), we expect that in the near future the international community will witness full normalization of the situation in that country.

In conclusion, we would like to express our gratitude to Ambassador Dahlgren for his effective and highly professional leadership of the sanctions Committee concerning Sierra Leone.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I would like to express my thanks to all members for their kind words addressed to me and for their cooperation in holding this kind of general public meeting. In this connection, I would like to mention that credit goes to my predecessors as well. Would the representative of Sweden like to comment on the statements made thus far?

Mr. Dahlgren (Sweden): Allow me also to thank all my colleagues around the table for their kind words addressed to me.

I would like to comment on the two questions that were posed by the representatives of Japan and the United States on the proposal for joint border surveillance between Sierra Leone and Liberia and possible assistance in that endeavour by the United Nations. This proposal, as I understand it, still has to be elaborated by the two countries. It is my understanding that only this week the Vice-President of Sierra Leone was in Monrovia and spoke to President Taylor and gave him the positive reply from President Kabbah, and I take it that there will be an intensive consultation between those two countries. I would suggest that the Secretariat, through the very able representatives that the Secretary-General has in both Freetown and Monrovia, follow up on these discussions as quickly as possible in order to obtain more details.

There are two parts to this. I suppose. The first part may be less difficult. Technical assistance could be envisaged to support these common border patrols. The second part relates to the positioning of United Nations observers themselves in the border zone. As I said, necessary security assurances must be obtained, and it would be supposed, I would assume, that the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) or the Government of Sierra Leone had established control over the border areas on the ground. That is not the case today, and until we have that situation, there is not enough security.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I invite the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations to comment on the statements that have been made.

Mr. Miyet (Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations): I should like to comment first on the points raised by Ambassador Dahlgren. I, too, want to thank him for the quality of his report and for his dedication.

The question of joint border monitoring is one that we have certainly examined. As he said, these are essentially questions of security, and I would suggest that there is a role for the Sierra Leonean authorities and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) to play. For the time being, taking into account the difficulties and the means at the disposal of ECOMOG, it is clear that they do not have the capacity to deploy their troops along the borders. They are so actively engaged on other very difficult fronts that it would be difficult for them. It is clear that we cannot send even an assessment team if there is no security provided, and we are not in a position to do that at this point.

It must be clear that there are priorities at this point. The Secretary-General stated in a report in June 1998 that monitoring would improve the situation in the region. But I think that because of the difficulties on the ground, the security situation and ECOMOG's lack of means, the difficulty of trying to deploy people in the jungle — and it is a jungle — would create big difficulties.

(*spoke in French*)

A second issue was raised by the representative of the United States with regard to measures taken to guarantee the safety of the observers. I should first like to say that this is daily concern for us; for the special representatives on the ground, the force commanders who are there observing and the heads of the military observers, it is a constant concern. New instructions were given two days ago to ensure that every step is taken to deal with the renewed rebel activity near Freetown. Of course, we are continuously reviewing the security situation at each of the sites where observers are deployed. As I said earlier, for security reasons not all the observers have been deployed yet — just 40 out of 70. Furthermore, it was decided two days ago that only air transport would be used, and when ECOMOG assures us that the safety of our personnel can be assured at the destinations.

In Sierra Leone, as with other missions in which we are involved where the risks are considerable, we are endeavouring, working closely with our representatives on the ground, to deal with developments.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.3958

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

Provisional

3958th Meeting

Monday, 21 December 1998, 1.45 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Buallay	(Bahrain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Patriota
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Costa Rica	Mr. Sáenz Biolley
	France	Mr. Teixeira da Silva
	Gabon	Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi
	Gambia	Mr. Jagne
	Japan	Mr. Tanaka
	Kenya	Mr. Mahugu
	Portugal	Mr. Soares
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Slovenia	Mr. Mr. Lenarčič
	Sweden	Mr. Lidén
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Eldon
	United States of America	Mr. Minton

Agenda

The situation in Guinea-Bissau

98-86740 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 1.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Guinea-Bissau

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Guinea-Bissau and Togo, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Cabral (Guinea-Bissau) took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Kpotsra (Togo) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/1998/1202, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to documents S/1998/1178, which contains the text of a letter dated 15 December 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Togo to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the text of the final communiqué and the additional protocol to the Abuja Accord of 1 November 1998 concerning the formation of the Government of National Unity of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, signed at the conclusion of the meeting held in Lomé on 14 and 15 December 1998 within the framework of the Guinea-Bissau peace process.

It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/1998/1202) before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Bahrain, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, France, Gabon, Gambia, Japan, Kenya, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1216 (1998).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.